arXiv:1302.7238v1 [math.GN] 25 Feb 2013

On Bubbling of Linearly Ordered Sets. Part I

Maria Viktorovna Droganova[*]
Valentin Vankov Iliev[†]

Abstract

Given a loset I, every surjective map $\pi\colon A \to I$ endows the set A with a structure of preordered set by "replacing" the elements $\iota \in I$ with their inverse images $\pi^{-1}(\iota)$ considered as "bubbles" (sets endowed with an equivalence relation), lifting the structure of loset on A, and "agglutinating" this structure with the bubbles. Every bubbling A of a structure of loset I is a structure of preordered set A (not necessarily complete) whose preorder has negatively transitive asymmetric part and every such structure on a given set A can be obtained by bubbling up of certain structure of a loset I, intrinsically encoded in A. In other words, the difference between linearity and negative transitivity is constituted of bubbles. As a consequence of this characterization, under certain natural topological conditions on the preordered set A furnished with its interval topology, the existence of a continuous generalized utility function on A is proved.

Introduction

> If there has been a first man he must have been born without father or mother which is repugnant to nature. For there could not have been a first egg to give a beginning to birds, or there should have been a first bird which gave a beginning to eggs; for a bird comes from an egg.
>
> *Aristotle*

The aim of this paper is threefold: to prove a necessary and sufficient condition for a preorder to have a negatively transitive asymmetric part, to study the degrees of freedom when constructing such preorders, and, moreover, to prove the existence of a continuous generalized utility function on the corresponding preordered set furnished with its interval topology with respect to which it is connected and separable. Since the authors can not find appropriate source(s) for citing, they allow themselves to systemize here from a unique point of view

---

[*] Department of Economics, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708-0097, USA

[†] Institute of Mathematics and Informatics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia 1113, Bulgaria

material that is spread out either as a folklore or can be found presented in various texts using varying terminology and notation at different levels of rigour and generality. Many of these texts have the great advantage of being easy understandable but their dark side is that they are not stable — many details are omitted by veiling them with fluent phrases and as a result small perturbations yield wrong conclusions.

In what follows, we use in general the terminology from [11] and [7].

In the sea of works devoted the mathematical foundations of the choice theory we rely on the harbours of three big islands: Fishburn, Kreps, and Ok. Their mathematical counterpart is the group Bourbaki who develop systematically the foundations of the whole mathematics and, in particular, the theory of (pre)ordered sets. One of the authors shares the philosophy of Nicolas Bourbaki that along with the new discoveries in mathematics, a silent process of building the grounds must go on in order to prevent us from ambiguous reading or writing. As a result of this inner conviction, the first two sections of the paper contain the main statements that allow us to give a concise rigorous proof of Theorem 3.1.1, its inverse Theorem 3.2.1, and the existence of a continuous generalized utility function (Theorem 3.3.2), as well as to serve as a useful text for those who work in choice theory.

The Aristotle's quote reflects our settled opinion of the question what is primary, the weak (pre)order or the strict order (preference), nothing to speak of the meaning of these notions, which varies from author to author and often is psychologically loaded. In history of mathematics, primary is the strict order defined by, for example, F. Hausdorff in [8] as irreflexive and transitive binary relation. The weak order is constructed later on by adding the relation of equality, thus obtaining a reflexive, transitive and antisymmetric binary relation. The weak order produces back in a unique way the strict order as its asymmetric part (hence, by pulling out the equality — its symmetric part). More generally, the adding of the affix "pre" does not change substantially the above setup because it is equivalent to replacing the relation of equality by any equivalence relation which is disjoint from the strict order.

Proposition 2.1.3 asserts that the jointing an equivalence relation E to a binary relation F with $E \cap F = \emptyset$ produces a reflexive binary relation $R = E \cup F$ and that the transitivity of R yields the E-saturation of F (see 1.1). On the other hand, the R-saturation of F implies the transitivity of R and all three conditions are equivalent in case F is transitive because of Proposition 2.1.5.

Let us start with a reflexive and transitive binary relation R on a set A (that is, a preorder) and decompose it as a disjoint union of its symmetric part $E = I_R$ (an equivalence relation) and its asymmetric part $F = P_R$ (an asymmetric and transitive relation). Moreover, F is E-saturated. Conversely, any ordered pair (E, F) of such relations produces a reflexive and transitive relation R by forming their union: $R = E \cup F$. In accord with Theorem 2.1.9, $R \mapsto (I_R, P_R)$ is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of of all reflexive and transitive binary relations R on A and the set of all ordered pairs (E, F), where E is an equivalence relation on A, F is an asymmetric transitive binary relation on A, which is E-saturated and $E \cap F = \emptyset$.

In particular, a strict order F on a set A produces a unique weak order R with asymmetric part F by adding the diagonal of A: $R = D_A \cup F$, and many preorders R with asymmetric part F by adding an equivalence relation E disjoint from F: $R = E \cup F$. This is the only philosophical reason (if any) for the strict order to have prior claim to consideration.

Replacing the transitivity of $F = P_R$ with the stronger assumption of negative transitivity, we enter the waters of Fishburn and Kreps ([6], [9]). In Proposition 2.1.7 we prove that the negative transitivity of F is equivalent to the completeness of its complementary relation $R = F^c$ as well as to the fact that $I_R = E_F$ and $P_R = F^{-1}$, where xE_Fy means "x and y are not F-comparable" and F^{-1} is the inverse relation. These equivalences clarify one of the connections between negative transitivity and completeness and make needless logical "analyses" similar to [12]. The nature of the other connection is, as if though, more fundamental and is the main subject of the present paper. In mathematical economics, the idea descends from Fishburn and his Theorem 2.1 in [6, Ch. 2, Sec. 2.2]. Under the above equivalences, he notes that $\mathcal{E} = E_F$ is an equivalence relation and that the partition $\{F, \mathcal{E}, F^{-1}\}$ of A^2 can be factorized with respect to $\mathcal{E}$, thus producing a linearly ordered factor-set. In mathematics this idea is older and one can find it, for example, in [2, Ch. III, Sec. 1, Exercise 4], where N. Bourbaki factorizes a partially ordered set with respect to the transitive closure of the relation "x and y are not comparable or $x = y$" and obtains a linearly ordered factor-set. This result is presented here, faintly generalized for a preorder R, as Theorem 2.2.3. If we strengthen the condition of the later theorem by assuming that the asymmetric part F of R is negative transitive, we obtain our Theorem 3.1.1 which generalizes Fishburn's theorem. More precisely, the negative transitivity allows us to show that F is $\mathcal{E}$-saturated and the triple $\{F, E, F^{-1}\}$, where E is the symmetric part of R, can be factored out with respect to the equivalence relation $\mathcal{E}$. The triple of factors $\{F/\mathcal{E}, E/\mathcal{E}, F^{-1}/\mathcal{E}\}$ is a partition of the factor-set $A' = A/\mathcal{E}$, we have $E/\mathcal{E} = D_{A'}$, $F^{-1}/\mathcal{E} = (F/\mathcal{E})^{-1}$, and $R' = D_{A'} \cup (F/\mathcal{E})$ is a linear order on A'. Since $\mathcal{E} = E \cup E_R$, the $\mathcal{E}$-equivalence classes (that is, the fibres of the canonical surjective map $c\colon A \to A'$, $x \mapsto$ the equivalence class of x) are disjoint unions of E-equivalence classes and the members of different E-equivalence classes in a fixed $\mathcal{E}$-equivalence class are not R-comparable. We call *bubbles* the fibres of the canonical surjective map c (that is, the $\mathcal{E}$-equivalence classes). Moreover, we use the term *E-indifference curve* as a synonym of E-equivalence class. The structure of the bubbles turns out to be very simple: Every bubble is a disjoint union of E-indifference curves and the members of different indifferent curves in this bubble are R-incomparable. In particular, every bubble is E-saturated and hence inherits from E its own equivalence relation. In case the later equivalence relation on every bubble is trivial, that is, every bubble coincides with an E-indifference curve, or, what is the same, when $\mathcal{E} = E$, then $E_R = \emptyset$ and we obtain the completeness of R and Fishburn's Theorem 2.1. Conversely, starting with a linearly ordered set I and with a family $(A_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$ of bubbles, that is, sets A_ι each endowed with an equivalence relation E_ι, $\iota \in I$, we construct in Theorem 3.2.1 a set A — the coproduct of the family $(A_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$ elaborated in

Proposition 2.3.1, the natural projection $\pi\colon A \to I$, and a preorder R on A with negatively transitive asymmetric part $F = P_R$, such that the equivalence relation $E = I_R$ induces on every bubble $\pi^{-1}(\iota) = A_\iota$ the equivalence relation E_ι. Moreover, the equivalence relation associated with the partition $(A_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$ of A is identical to $\mathcal{E}$, the linear order on I is the factor-relation of R, and the corresponding strict linear order on I is the factor-relation of F with respect to $\mathcal{E}$. Thus, every bubbling A of a structure of linearly ordered set I is a structure of preordered set A with negatively transitive asymmetric part and every such structure on a given set A can be obtained by bubbling up of certain structure of a linearly ordered set I, intrinsically encoded in A.

G. Debreu is the first author who (not without influence from N. Bourbaki) studies in [4] the existence of a continuous utility representation $u\colon A \to \mathbb{R}$ of a complete preordered set A. Lemma 3.3.1 reduces the problem to the existence of a strictly increasing and continuous map of the factor-set A/E into $\mathbb{R}$. Under the condition of connectedness and separability on A endowed with a "natural" topology (that is, topology which is finer than the interval topology on A), G. Debreu proves this existence by refereing to [4, (6.1)]. He outlines also another proof by using the classical inductive procedure that goes back to G. Cantor. First, he embeds in an order-preserving way the countable part of the factor A/E in the real line $\mathbb{R}$ and then fills the gaps by using a non-decreasing step function. It is needles to say that in this short paper all technical difficulties are avoided. In his monograph [6], P. C. Fishburn proves (Theorem 2.2) that if the set A is furnished with a strict order (in our terminology) which is negatively transitive and if the factor-set A/E is countable, then there exists a utility function $u\colon A \to \mathbb{R}$. Further, in [6, Theorem 3.1] he presents a necessary and sufficient condition for a negatively transitive strict order to possess a utility function, which is, in fact, the Birkhoff's criterium [1, Ch. III, Theorem 2] for the loset A/E to be embedded in a order-preserving way into the real line.

In [10, Sec. 5], E. A. Ok argues that "...utility theory can be beneficially extended to cover incomplete preference relations" and, moreover, "Identifying a useful set of conditions on preorderes that would lead to such a representation result [that is, functional representation of preorders] is an open problem worthy of investigation".

Our setup uses the sufficient condition (connectedness and separability) from [3, Ch. IV, Sec. 2, Exercise 11 a] for the the existence of a homeomorphic embedding of factor-set $A/\mathcal{E}$ into the real line (see also Theorem A.2.24). If the preorder on A has negatively transitive asymmetric part, there is a close bond between the topologies of A and $A/\mathcal{E}$ described in Theorem 2.4.1. Using this strong relationship, in case A is connected and separable we prove the existence of a continuous generalized utility function on A (Theorem 3.3.2).

The aim of the appendix is to give a proof of Theorem A.2.24 which asserts that any linearly ordered set A endowed with the interval topology which is connected and separable possesses a strictly increasing homeomorphism onto one of the intervals in the real line with endpoints 0 and 1. The text represents the slightly dressed up notes of the authors during reading of [2, Ch. III, Sec. 1], the problems from [3, Ch. IV, Sec. 2, Exercises 6, 7, 8, 9, 11], and other relevant literature.

Part of this paper is part of the senior thesis of the first author made under the supervision of the second one. We intend to devote Part 2 of the paper to some economic applications of our results.

1 Binary relations

> ... At first there is a language, already formed, which we use as we would a very poor instrument. From time to time reversals occur - from phlogiston to oxygen, for instance. Lavoisier introduces the right concept, oxygen, at the same time as his phlogistic. The root of difficulty is that you can only introduce symbols, mathematical or otherwise, by using everyday language since you have, after all, to explain what are you going to do with them.
>
> Jacques Lacan, The Seminar 1953 - 1954, Freud's papers on Technique, p. 2.

1.1 Definitions and basic logical relations

If the opposite is not stated explicitly, we assume that the occurrence of the variables x, y, $z, \ldots$ in a statement is bounded by the universal quantifier ("for all"). Moreover, the variables run through all values such that the corresponding expressions make sense.

Let A be a set. A *binary relation* R on A is a subset $R \subset A \times A$. For $x, y \in A$ we write xRy if $(x, y) \in R$. If xRy or yRx the elements x and y are said to be *R-comparable*, otherwise — *R-incomparable*. The relation $R^{-1} = \{(x, y) \in A \times A \mid (y, x) \in R\}$ is called *inverse* to R, the relation $R^c = \{(x, y) \in A \times A \mid (x, y) \notin R\}$ is called *complementary* to R, the relation $D_A = \{(x, y) \in A \times A \mid x = y\}$ is called (with an abuse of the language) the *diagonal* of A, $R = A^2$ is said to be the *trivial* relation, and $R = \emptyset$ is called the *empty* relation on A.

Let A and A' be two sets endowed with the binary relations R and R', respectively. A map $c \colon A \to A'$ is said to be *increasing* if xRy implies $c(x)R'c(y)$.

A binary relation R on A is called *reflexive* if xRx, (that is, $D_A \subset R$), *irreflexive* if R^c is reflexive (that is, $R \cap D_A = \emptyset$), *symmetric* if xRy implies yRx (that is, $R^{-1} = R$), *antisymmetric* if xRy and yRx imply $x = y$ (that is, $R^{-1} \cap R \subset D_A$), *asymmetric* if xRy implies yR^cx (that is, $R^{-1} \cap R = \emptyset$), and *complete* if xRy or yRx (that is, $R^{-1} \cup R = A^2$).

Let R and S be two binary relations on A. The relation S is said to be *left R-saturated* (respectively, *right R-saturated*) if xRy and ySz imply xSz (respectively, xSy and yRz imply xSz). In case S is both left and right R-saturated, it is called *R-saturated*. The relation S is called (with an abuse of the language) *weakly R-saturated* if xRy and ySz imply the existence of $t \in A$ such that zRt and xSt. In case R is reflexive, any left R-saturated relation S is weakly R-saturated.

A binary relation R on A is said to be *transitive* if R is R-saturated (that is, xRy and yRz imply xRz) and *negatively transitive* if xRz implies xRy or yRz.

Equivalence relation on A is a reflexive, symmetric and transitive binary relation. The diagonal D_A is the least equivalence relation on A, contained by any equivalence relation.

Let R be a binary relation on A and let E be an equivalence relation on A. The relation R is called E-*complete* if $R \cup R^{-1} = A^2 \backslash E$.

Proposition 1.1.1 *Let A be a set and R be a binary relation on A. The statements in any row of the table below are equivalent:*

(i)	R *is symmetric*	R^{-1} *is symmetric*	R^c *is symmetric*
(ii)	R *is asymmetric*	R^{-1} *is asymmetric*	R^c *is complete*
(iii)	R *is transitive*	R^{-1} *is transitive*	R^c *is negatively transitive*
(iv)	R *is negatively transitive*	R^{-1} *is negatively transitive*	R^c *is transitive*

Proof: (i) The equalities $R = R^{-1}$, $R^{-1} = (R^{-1})^{-1}$, and $R^c = (R^c)^{-1}$ are equivalent.

(ii) The equalities $R \cap R^{-1} = \emptyset$, $R^{-1} \cap (R^{-1})^{-1} = \emptyset$, and $R^c \cup (R^c)^{-1} = A^2$ are equivalent.

(iii) The three statements are equivalent because the corresponding defining sentences "xRy and yRz implies xRz", "$zR^{-1}y$ and $yR^{-1}x$ implies $zR^{-1}x$", and "xR^cz implies xR^cy or yR^cz", respectively, are equivalent.

(iv) The proof is analogous to that of part (iii).

Proposition 1.1.2 *Let A be a set and let R be a binary relation on A.*

(i) *If R is reflexive, antisymmetric, and negatively transitive, then R is transitive.*

(ii) *If R is asymmetric and negatively transitive, then R is transitive.*

Proof: The assumptions xRy, yRz, and the negative transitivity yield the conjunction "xRz or zRy" and "yRx or xRz" which is equivalent to

$$\text{“}xRz \text{ and } yRx\text{” or “}xRz \text{ and } xRz\text{” or “}zRy \text{ and } yRx\text{” or “}zRy \text{ and } xRz\text{”}. \tag{1.1.1}$$

(i) Let us suppose that xRy and yRz. Since "yRx and xRy" implies $x = y$ and "zRy and yRz" implies $y = z$, the statement (1.1.1) yields

"xRz and $x = y$" or xRz or "$x = y = z$" or "$y = z$ and xRz".

In the case $x = y = z$ the reflexivity of R implies xRz, hence we obtain always xRz, that is, R is transitive.

(ii) If xRy and yRz, then yR^cx and zR^cy and hence the statement (1.1.1) implies xRz. In other words, R is transitive.

Proposition 1.1.3 *Let R be a binary relation on a set A. One has:*

(i) *If R is asymmetric, then it is irreflexive.*

(ii) *If R is irreflexive and transitive, then it is asymmetric.*

(iii) *If R is complete, then it is reflexive.*

(iv) *If R is transitive and complete, then it is negatively transitive.*

Proof: (i) We have $D_A \cap R \subset R^{-1}$ and the assumption $D_A \cap R \neq \emptyset$ produces the contradiction $R \cap R^{-1} \neq \emptyset$.

(ii) Let us suppose that R is not asymmetric and let $(x, y) \in R \cap R^{-1}$. This means xRy and yRx and the transitivity yields xRx which is a contradiction.

(iii) Since $R \cup R^{-1} = A^2$ and since $D_A \cap R = D_A \cap R^{-1}$, we have $D_A = D_A \cap R$, that is, $D_A \subset R$, so R is reflexive.

(iv) Proposition 1.1.1, (ii), (iii), yield that the relation $F = R^c$ is asymmetric and negatively transitive. In accord with Proposition 1.1.2, (ii), F is transitive and hence $R = F^c$ is negatively transitive.

Parts (i) and (ii) of Proposition 1.1.3 yield immediately

Corollary 1.1.4 *Let R be a binary relation on a set A. The following two statements are equivalent:*

(i) *R is asymmetric and transitive.*

(ii) *R is irreflexive and transitive.*

By a *preorder* on a set A we mean a binary relation R on A which is reflexive and transitive. *Partial order* on a set A is a binary relation $\leq$ on A which is reflexive, antisymmetric, and transitive. As usual, we denote by $<$ the asymmetric part of $\leq$. Any complete partial order is also called *linear order*.

A set A endowed with a preorder R is said to be *preordered set*. A set A together with a partial order $\leq$ is said to be *partially ordered set*. In case $\leq$ is a linear order, A is called *linearly ordered set*. A preordered set whose preorder is symmetric is said to be *bubble*. In other words, bubbles are preordered sets whose preorders are equivalence relation. The empty set $A = \emptyset$ endowed with the empty relation $R = \emptyset$ is an example of preordered set.

In what follows we assume that any preordered set is not empty and then its preorder is not empty, too.

Let A and A' be preordered sets and let F and F' be the asymmetric parts of their preorders. A map $c\colon A \to A'$ is called *strictly increasing* if xFy implies $c(x)F'c(y)$.

1.2 Derivative relations

Let R be a binary relation on a set A. We set $I_R = R \cap R^{-1}$, $U_R = R \cup R^{-1}$, $P_R = R \backslash I_R$, and $E_R = U_R^c$. The relation I_R is called *symmetric part* of R and the relation P_R is said to be *asymmetric part* of R. These definitions yield immediately the following:

Proposition 1.2.1 *Let R be a binary relation on a set A. One has:*

(i) $I_R^c = U_{R^c}$.
(ii) $I_{R^c} = E_R$.
(iii) $P_R^c = R^c \cup R^{-1}$.
(iv) $E_{P_R} = E_R \cup I_R$.

Proposition 1.2.2 *Let A be a set and R be a binary relation on A. The statements in any row of the table below are equivalent:*

(i)	*R is reflexive*	*R^{-1} is reflexive*	*I_R is reflexive*
(ii)	*R is symmetric*	$R = I_R$	$P_R = \emptyset$
(iii)	*R is asymmetric*	$R = P_R$	$I_R = \emptyset$

(iv) *Under the conditions of part* (ii), *one has $E_R = R^c$.*
(v) *Under the conditions of part* (iii), *E_R is reflexive and U_{R^c} is complete.*

Proof: (i) We have $D_A \subset R^{-1}$ if and only if $D_A \subset R$ and this, in turn, is equivalent to $D_A \subset I_R$.

(ii) The two equalities $R = I_R$ and $P_R = \emptyset$ are equivalent and are implied by the equality $R = R^{-1}$. Conversely, if $R = I_R$, then $R \subset R^{-1}$. Taking inverses, we obtain $R^{-1} \subset R$, hence R is symmetric.

(iii) The two equalities $R = P_R$ and $I_R = \emptyset$ are equivalent and the last one means that R is asymmetric.

(iv) It is enough to note that $R = U_R$.

(v) Proposition 1.1.3, (i), yields $D_A \cap R = D_A \cap R^{-1} = \emptyset$, hence $D_A \cap U_R = \emptyset$. In other words, $D_A \subset E_R$. Moreover, in accord with Proposition 1.2.1, (i), we obtain $U_{R^c} = I_R^c = A^2$.

Proposition 1.2.3 *Let A be a set and R be a binary relation on A. One has:*

(i) *I_R, U_R, and E_R, are symmetric and P_R is asymmetric.*
(ii) *If R is reflexive, then I_R, U_R, and P_R^c are reflexive.*
(iii) *If R is transitive, then I_R and P_R are transitive.*

Proof: (i) We have $I_R^{-1} = R^{-1} \cap R = I_R$, $U_R^{-1} = R^{-1} \cup R = U_R$, $E_R^{-1} = (U_R^{-1})^c = U_R^c = E_R$. On the other hand, since $(R\backslash R^{-1})^{-1} = R^{-1}\backslash R$, we obtain $P_R \cap P_R^{-1} = (R\backslash R^{-1}) \cap (R^{-1}\backslash R) = \emptyset$.

(ii) If $D \subset R$, then $D \subset R^{-1}$ and therefore $D \subset I_R$, $D \subset U_R$. Further, in accord with Proposition 1.2.1, (ii), we have $P_R^c = R^c \cup R^{-1}$ and, in particular, $D \subset P_R^c$.

(iii) Since the inverse relation R^{-1} is transitive, the intersection $I_R = R \cap R^{-1}$ is also transitive. Let xP_Ry and yP_Rz. Then xRy, yRz, and this implies xRz. If we suppose that zRx, then yRx which contradicts xP_Ry. Therefore zR^cx and we have xP_Rz.

Proposition 1.2.4 *Let A be a set and R be a binary relation on A. If R is negatively transitive, then E_R is transitive.*

Proof: If R is negatively transitive, then according to Proposition 1.1.1, (iv), R^{-1} is negatively transitive too and the relations R^c and $(R^{-1})^c$ are transitive. In particular, their intersection $E_R = R^c \cap (R^{-1})^c$ is also transitive.

1.3 Transitive Closure

Let A be a set. The intersection of a family of transitive binary relations on A is a transitive binary relation on A. Thus, given a binary relation R on A, we can build its *transitive closure* $R^{(t)}$ by letting $R^{(t)}$ to be the intersection of all transitive binary relations on A, which contain R. Note that the trivial relation A^2 is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive binary relation on A, that contains R. The transitive closure is the minimal (with respect to inclusion) binary transitive relation which contains R.

Proposition 1.3.1 *Let R be a binary relation on the set A. One has $xR^{(t)}y$ if and only if there exists a finite sequence $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n$ of elements of A, such that $x = a_0$, $y = a_n$, and $a_{i-1}Ra_i$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.*

Proof: We define the relation S on A by the rule: xSy if there exists a finite sequence $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n$ of elements of A, such that $x = a_0$, $y = a_n$, and $a_{i-1}Ra_i$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. If xRy, then the sequence $a_0 = x$, $a_1 = y$ yields xSy; thus, we have $R \subset S$. By concatenating the sequences which assure xSy and ySz, we obtain xSz; hence S is transitive. Now, let R' be a transitive binary relation which contains R, let xSy, and let $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n$ be the sequence of elements of A, such that $x = a_0$, $y = a_n$, and $a_{i-1}Ra_i$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Then we have $a_{i-1}R'a_i$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, and the transitivity of R' implies $xR'y$. Therefore $S \subset R'$, so S is the minimal transitive binary relation which contains R. In other words, $S = R^{(t)}$.

We obtain immediately

Corollary 1.3.2 *If R and S are binary relations on a set A and $R \subset S$, then $R^{(t)} \subset S^{(t)}$.*

Corollary 1.3.3 *If the binary relation R on a set A is reflexive and symmetric, then its transitive closure $R^{(t)}$ is an equivalence relation on A.*

The $R^{(t)}$-equivalence classes are said to be the *connected components* of the set A with respect to the relation R.

1.4 Factorizations

Let E be an equivalence relation on the set A. For $x \in A$ we define the *equivalence class* with respect to E (or, *E-equivalence class*) with representative x by $C_x = \{y \in A \mid yEx\}$. We also denote C_x by $C_{x,E}$ and call it the equivalence class of x. The transitive closure $E^{(t)}$ of an equivalence relation E coincides with E and the connected components of the set A with respect to E are simply the E-equivalence classes. The subset $B \subset A$ is said to be *saturated with respect to E*, or *E-saturated*, if $x \in B$ implies $C_x \subset B$. Let A/E be the set of all equivalent classes, called the *factor-set* of A with respect to E. The factor-set A/E is a partition of A and the surjective map $c = c_E \colon A \to A/E$, $x \mapsto C_x$, is said to be the *canonical surjective map*. Sometimes we write $\bar{x} = c(x)$. Conversely, any partition of the set A produces an equivalence relation called *associated* with this partition.

This setup can be generalized substantially. Let E, S be two equivalence relations on the set A and let $E \subset S$. Then the partition A/E is finer than the partition A/S, hence there exists a canonical surjective map $c_{E,S}\colon A/E \to A/S$, $C_{x,E} \mapsto C_{x,S}$ for $x \in A$. Thus, any member of A/S is the union of all members of its inverse image via the map $c_{E,S}$.

Let E be an equivalence relation on a set A and let E' be an equivalence relation on a set A'. We define an equivalence relation $\mathcal{E}$ in the Cartesian product $A \times A'$ by the rule $(x, x')\mathcal{E}(y, y')$ if xEy and $x'E'y'$, and call $\mathcal{E}$ *product* of the equivalence relations E and E'. Notation: $\mathcal{E} = E \times E'$.

The relation R is left E-saturated (respectively, right E-saturated) if and only if the subset $R \subset A \times A$ is saturated with respect to the product $E\times =$ (respectively, to the product $= \times E$). The relation R is E-saturated if and only if the subset $R \subset A \times A$ is saturated with respect to the product $E \times E$.

Let E be an equivalence relation on A and let $c\colon A \to A/E$ be the canonical map. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the equivalent relation on $A \times A$ which is product of E with itself and let $c_2\colon A \times A \to (A \times A)/\mathcal{E}$ be the corresponding canonical map. Since $c_2(x, y) = c_2(x', y')$ if and only if $(c(x), c(y)) = (c(x'), c(y'))$, we can define a canonical bijection

$$c_2'\colon (A/E) \times (A/E) \to (A \times A)/\mathcal{E},\ (c(x), c(y)) \mapsto c_2(x, y)$$

via which we identify $(A/E) \times (A/E)$ and $(A \times A)/\mathcal{E}$. Then $c_2 = c \times c$ so the surjective map

$$c_2\colon A \times A \to (A/E) \times (A/E),\ c_2(x, y) = (\bar{x}, \bar{y})$$

is canonical and induces via the rule $X \mapsto c_2(X)$, $X \subset A \times A$, a canonical surjective map

$$c_2\colon 2^{A\times A} \to 2^{(A/E)\times(A/E)}. \tag{1.4.1}$$

Proposition 1.4.1 *The canonical surjective map c_2 from (1.4.1) establishes a bijection $R \mapsto \bar{R}$, where $\bar{R} = c_2(R)$, between the set of all E-saturated binary relations R on A and the set of all binary relations $\bar{R} \subset (A/E) \times (A/E)$ on the factor-set A/E. For any E-saturated binary relation R on A we have xRy if and only if $\bar{x}\bar{R}\bar{y}$.*

Proof: For any binary relation S on A/E the inverse image $R = c_2^{-1}(S)$ is a union of equivalence classes (with respect to $\mathcal{E}$), hence it is $\mathcal{E}$-saturated and we have $\bar{R} = S$. On the other hand, for any binary relation R' on A we have $R' \subset c_2^{-1}(\bar{R}')$. If, in addition, R' is $\mathcal{E}$-saturated, then $R' = c_2^{-1}(\bar{R}')$.

In accord with Proposition 1.4.1, any E-saturated binary relation R on the set A produces a relation $\bar{R} = c_2(R)$ on the factor-set A/E which we call *factor-relation* and denote $\bar{R} = R/E$. We have xRy if and only if $\bar{x}(R/E)\bar{y}$.

Below we present a natural factorization R' of a binary relation R on a set A with respect to an equivalence relation E.

Let R be a binary relation on the set A and let E be an equivalence relation on A. Let $A' = A/E$ be the factor-set and let $A \to A'$, $x \mapsto \bar{x}$, be the canonical surjective map. We define the binary relation R' on A' by the rule

$$\bar{x}R'\bar{y} \text{ if for any } x' \in \bar{x} \text{ there exists } y' \in \bar{y} \text{ such that } x'Ry'.$$

and call R' *weak factor-relation* of R with respect to the equivalence relation E, thus generalizing the same notion introduced after Proposition 1.4.1. This is a generalization of [2, Ch. III, Sec. 1, Exercise 2, a]

2 Mathematical Background: Second Layer

> Concepts have their specific order in reality. They do not emerge out of human experience — if they did, they would be well made. The first appellations arise out of words themselves, they are instruments of delineating things ...
>
> Jacques Lacan, The Seminar 1953 - 1954, Freud's papers on Technique, p. 2.

Below, for the sake of completeness and non-ambiguous reading of this paper, we present the main statements which are used.

2.1 Saturatedness, Transitivity, Completeness

Lemma 2.1.1 *Let A be a set, let R be a reflexive binary relation on A, and let E be an equivalence relation on A. If $R \subset E$, then R is weakly E-saturated.*

Proof: Let $x'Ex$ and xRy. Then $x'Ey$ and if we set $y' = x'$, then yEy' and $x'Ry'$ because R is reflexive.

Proposition 2.1.2 *Let R be a binary relation on the set A and let E be an equivalence relation on A. Let $A' = A/E$ be the factor-set and let $c\colon A \to A'$, $x \mapsto \bar{x}$, be the canonical surjective map. Then the canonical map c is increasing if and only if R is weakly E-saturated.*

Under the condition that R is weakly E-saturated, the following statements hold:

(i) *If R is reflexive, then R' is reflexive.*

(ii) *If R is transitive, then R' is transitive.*

(iii) *The relation R' is antisymmetric if and only if R satisfies the condition*

$$xRy,\ yRz, \text{ and } xEz \text{ imply } xEy. \tag{2.1.1}$$

(iv) *If R is E-saturated, then R' coincides with the factor-relation $\bar{R}$ from Proposition 1.4.1. If, in addition, $I_R \subset E$, then condition (2.1.1) holds.*

(v) *Let B be a set endowed with a binary relation S. For any increasing map $\pi\colon A \to B$ which is constant on the members of the factor-set $A' = A/E$ there exists a unique increasing map $\pi'\colon A' \to B$ such that the diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
A \arrow[d, "c"] \arrow[dr, "\pi"] & \\
A' \arrow[r, "\pi'"] & B
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative. If π is surjective, then π' is surjective. If, in addition,

$$E = \{(x, y) \in A^2 \mid \pi(x) = \pi(y)\}, \tag{2.1.2}$$

then π' is an increasing bijection.

Proof: Let us suppose that c is an increasing map, let xRy, and let $x'Ex$, that is, $x' \in \bar{x}$. We have $\bar{x}R'\bar{y}$ which means there exists $y' \in \bar{y}$ with $x'Ry'$ and hence R is weakly E-saturated. Conversely, if R is weakly E-saturated and if xRy, then for any $x' \in \bar{x}$ there exists $y' \in \bar{y}$ with $x'Ry'$, therefore $\bar{x}R'\bar{y}$.

The proofs of parts (i) and (ii) are immediate.

(iii) Let R satisfies condition (2.1.1) and let $\bar{x}R'\bar{y}$, $\bar{y}R'\bar{x}$. We have that there exist $y' \in \bar{y}$ and $x' \in \bar{x}$, such that xRy' and $y'Rx'$. Since xEx', we obtain xEy', that is, $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$. Conversely, let R' be antisymmetric and let us suppose that xRy, yRz, and xEz. In particular, $\bar{x}R'\bar{y}$, $\bar{y}R'\bar{x}$, and this yields $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$, that is, xEy.

(iv) We have $\bar{R} \subset R'$. Now, let $\bar{x}R'\bar{y}$ and let $x' \in \bar{x}$, $y' \in \bar{y}$. We have that there exists $y'' \in \bar{y}$ with $x'Ry''$. Since $y''Ey'$, the saturation of R yields $x'Ry'$. Thus, in accord with Proposition 1.4.1 we have $\bar{x}\bar{R}\bar{y}$. Now, let us suppose, in addition, that $I_R \subset E$ and let xRy, yRz, and xEz. Since R is E-saturated, we obtain yRx, hence xI_Ry and this, in turn, implies xEy.

(v) For any map $\pi\colon A \to B$ which is constant on the members of the factor-set $A' = A/E$ there exists a unique map $\pi'\colon A' \to B$ such that $\pi = \pi' \circ c$. Let $\bar{x}R'\bar{y}$ and we can suppose that xRy. Then $\pi(x)S\pi(y)$ and this relation can be rewritten as $\pi'(\bar{x})S\pi'(\bar{y})$. Therefore π' is an increasing map. Since $\pi(x) = \pi'(\bar{x})$ the surjectivity of π implies the surjectivity of π'. Under the condition (2.1.2), if $\pi(x) = \pi(y)$, then $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$, that is, π' is a bijection.

Proposition 2.1.3 *Let A be a set, let E be an equivalence relation on A, let F be a binary relation on A, let $E \cap F = \emptyset$, and let $R = E \cup F$.*

(i) *The relation R is reflexive.*

(ii) *If the relation R is transitive, then the relation F is E-saturated.*

(iii) *If the relation F is E-saturated, then the relation R is E-saturated.*

(iv) *The relation R is complete if and only if the relation F is E-complete.*

Proof: (i) We have $D \subset E$.

(ii) Let $x'Ex$ and xFy. The transitivity of R implies $x'Ry$. In case $x'Ey$ we have xEy which contradicts xFy. Thus, we obtain $x'Fy$. Hence F is left

E-saturated. Now, let xFy and yEy'. Again the transitivity of R implies xRy' and if xEy', then xEy which contradicts xFy. Thus, xFy' and therefore F is right E-saturated. In other words, the relation F is E-saturated.

(iii) Let xRy and $x'Ex$. If xFy, then $x'Fy$, hence $x'Ry$. Now, if xEy, then $x'Ey$ and again $x'Ry$. Now, let xRy and yEy'. If xFy, then we obtain xFy', hence xRy'. In case xEy we have xEy', therefore xRy'.

(iv) Since $E \cap (F \cup F^{-1}) = \emptyset$ and since $R \cup R^{-1} = E \cup F \cup F^{-1}$, the equalities $A^2 = R \cup R^{-1}$ and $A^2 \backslash E = F \cup F^{-1}$ are equivalent.

Proposition 2.1.4 *Let A be a set, let E be an equivalence relation on A, let F be a binary relation on A, let $E \cap F = \emptyset$, and let $R = E \cup F$. Let the relation F be R-saturated. Then one has:*

(i) *The relation R is transitive.*

(ii) *The relation F is E-saturated.*

Proof: (i) Let xRy and yRz. If xEy and yEz, then xEz, so xRz. Otherwise, we obtain "xRy and yFz" or "xFy and yRz" and in both cases we have xFz. Thus, the transitivity of R is proved.

(ii) The inclusion $E \subset R$ yields part (ii).

The proposition below shows that the saturation of a transitive binary relation F with respect to an equivalence relation E with $E \cap F = \emptyset$, the transitivity of their union $R = E \cup F$, and the R-saturation of F are equivalent statements.

Proposition 2.1.5 *Let A be a set and let E be an equivalence relation on A. Let F be a transitive binary relation on A, let $E \cap F = \emptyset$, and let $R = E \cup F$. Then the statements* (i), (ii), *and* (iii) *below are equivalent:*

(i) *The relation F is R-saturated.*

(ii) *The relation R is transitive.*

(iii) *The relation F is E-saturated.*

(iv) *If, in addition, $\{E, F, F^{-1}\}$ is a partition of the set A^2, then conditions* (i), (ii), *and* (iii) *hold.*

Proof: (i) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii) Proposition 2.1.4, (i), yields this implication.

(ii) $\Longrightarrow$ (iii) Let $x'Ex$ and xFy. Using the transitivity of R we have $x'Ry$. If $x'Ey$, then xEy which contradicts xFy. Thus, $x'Fy$. Now, let yEy' and xFy. Then the transitivity of R yields xRy' and again the assumption xEy' leads to the contradiction xEy. Therefore xFy'.

(iii) $\Longrightarrow$ (i) Let xRy and yFz. If xEy, then part (iii) implies xFz. Otherwise, xFy and using the transitivity of F, we obtain again xFz. Now, let xFy and yRz. If yEz, then part (iii) yields xFz. When yFz the transitivity of F implies xFz.

(iv) Let $\{E, F, F^{-1}\}$ be a partition of the set A^2 and let xEy, yFz. If xEz, then zEx, hence zEy, that is, yEz which contradicts yFz. If zFx, then yFx which contradicts yEx. Thus, we have xFz. Finally, let xFy, yEz. If xEz, then xEy which contradicts xFy. If zFx, then zFy which contradicts zEy. Again, we have xFz, so part (iii) holds.

Proposition 2.1.6 *Let the binary relation R on the set A be reflexive and transitive.*

(i) *One has: xRy and yP_Rz imply xP_Rz, xP_Ry and yRz imply xP_Rz.*

(ii) *The asymmetric part P_R is I_R-saturated.*

(iii) *The relation R is I_R-saturated.*

(iv) *The sets I_R, P_R, and P_R^{-1} are pairwise disjoint in A^2.*

Proof: We have $R = I_R \cup P_R$, $I_R \cap P_R = \emptyset$, and Proposition 1.2.3, (iii), implies that P_R is a transitive relation. Now, parts (i), (ii) hold because of Proposition 2.1.5 and then Proposition 2.1.3, (iii), yields part (iii). According to Proposition 1.2.3, (i), P_R is asymmetric and, moreover, $I_R \cap P_R^{-1} = (I_R \cap P_R)^{-1} = \emptyset$, which implies part (iv).

Proposition 2.1.7 *Let the binary relation R on the set A be reflexive and transitive. The following three statements are equivalent:*

(i) *The relation R is complete.*

(ii) *The complement R^c is asymmetric and negatively transitive.*

(iii) *One has $I_R = E_F$ and $P_R = F$, where $F = (R^{-1})^c$.*

Proof: Proposition 1.1.1, (ii), (iii), imply the equivalence of (i) and (ii).

(ii) $\Longrightarrow$ (iii) According to Proposition 1.1.1, (iv), the relation $F = (R^{-1})^c$ is negatively transitive. Using Proposition 1.2.1, (ii), we obtain $E_F = I_{F^c} = I_{(F^c)^{-1}} = I_R$. Further, because of Proposition 1.1.1, (ii), the relation $F = (R^c)^{-1}$ is asymmetric, that is, $F \cap F^{-1} = \emptyset$ and this is equivalent to $F \subset (F^{-1})^c = R$. Since $F \cap E_F = \emptyset$ and since $R = E_F \cup P_R$, we obtain $F \subset P_R$. On the other hand, $P_R = R \backslash R^{-1}$, hence $P_R \cap R^{-1} = \emptyset$. In other words, $P_R \cap F^c = \emptyset$, that is, $P_R \subset F$. Thus, we have $P_R = F$.

(iii) $\Longrightarrow$ (i) We have

$$R \cup R^{-1} = I_R \cup P_R \cup P_R^{-1} = E_F \cup F \cup F^{-1} = U_F^c \cup U_F = A^2.$$

Proposition 1.2.3 and Proposition 2.1.6 show that starting with a reflexive and transitive binary relation R on a set A we obtain an equivalence relation $E = I_R$ and a transitive binary relation $F = P_R$ on A, which is E-saturated. Moreover, the sets E, F, and F^{-1} are pairwise disjoint. The next proposition is the converse statement.

Proposition 2.1.8 *Let A be a set, let E be an equivalence relation on A, and let F be an asymmetric and transitive binary relation on A, which is E-saturated and such that $E \cap F = \emptyset$. Then $R = E \cup F$ is a reflexive and transitive binary relation on the set A, such that $E = I_R$ and $F = P_R$.*

Proof: Since $D \subset E$, the relation R is reflexive. Proposition 2.1.5 yields that R is a transitive relation. Moreover, the sets E, F, and F^{-1} are pairwise disjoint. We have

$$I_R = R \cap R^{-1} = (E \cup F) \cap (E \cup F^{-1}) =$$

$$(E \cap E) \cup (E \cap F^{-1}) \cup (F \cap E) \cup (F \cap F^{-1}) = E$$

and $F = R \backslash E = P_R$.

Theorem 2.1.9 *The rule*

$$R \mapsto (I_R, P_R), \tag{2.1.3}$$

establishes a bijection between the set of all reflexive and transitive binary relations R on the set A and the set of all ordered pairs (E, F), where E is an equivalence relation on A, F is an asymmetric transitive binary relation on A, which is E-saturated.

Proof: Let R be a reflexive and transitive binary relation on A and let $E = I_R$, $F = P_R$. Then we have $E \cap F = \emptyset$ and according to Proposition 1.2.3 and Proposition 2.1.6, (ii), E is an equivalence relation on A and F is E-saturated. Proposition 1.2.3, (i), (iii), yields that F is asymmetric and transitive. Now, Proposition 2.1.8 assures that the map (2.1.3) is surjective and since $R = I_R \cup P_R$, this map is injective.

Proposition 2.1.10 *Let A be a set and let R be an asymmetric and negatively transitive relation on A. Then E_R is an equivalence relation and the following two equivalent statements hold:*

(i) *The relation $\mathcal{R} = E_R \cup R$ is transitive.*
(ii) *The relation R is E_R-saturated.*

Proof: Proposition 1.2.3, (i), Proposition 1.2.2, (v), and Proposition 1.2.4 yield that E_R is an equivalence relation. Proposition 1.1.2, (ii), guaranteers that the relation R is transitive. In accord with Proposition 2.1.5, parts (i), (ii) are equivalent and since $\{E_R, R, R^{-1}\}$ is a partition of A^2, part (iv) of the same proposition yields that (i) and (ii) hold.

2.2 Indifference

Let A be a set. A binary relation R on A is said to be *indifference* if R is reflexive and symmetric. In case R is an indifference on A, Corollary 1.3.3 yields that its transitive closure $R^{(t)}$ is an equivalence relation on A and the connected components of the set A with respect to the relation R (that is, $R^{(t)}$-equivalence classes) are called *R-indifference curves.* Thus, the factor-set $A/R^{(t)}$ consists of all R-indifference curves. In case the relation R is self-understood, we denote by $\bar{x}$ the R-indifference curve with representative $x \in A$. Moreover, in accord with Corollary 1.3.2, if $R \subset S$, then the partition $A/R^{(t)}$ of A is finer than the partition $A/S^{(t)}$ and we obtain the following

Lemma 2.2.1 *If R and S are two indifferences on A with $R \subset S$, then any S-indifference curve is a disjoint union of R-indifference curves.*

Proposition 1.2.3, (i), and Proposition 1.2.2, (v), yield immediately part (i) of the following:

Proposition 2.2.2 *Let the binary relation R on A be asymmetric and transitive.*

(i) *The relation* E_R *is an indifference.*

(ii) *If* $\bar{x}$ *and* $\bar{y}$ *are two different* R*-indifference curves, then any two elements* $x' \in \bar{x}$ *and* $y' \in \bar{y}$ *are* R*-comparable and if* xRy*, then* $x'Ry'$*.*

Proof: (ii) Since $\bar{x} \neq \bar{y}$, any two elements $x' \in \bar{x}$ and $y' \in \bar{y}$ are R-comparable. Let, for example, xRy and let $y' \in \bar{y}$. Let $y = b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_n = y'$ be the finite sequence such that $b_i E_R b_{i+1}$, $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$. Note that $b_i \in \bar{y}$ for all $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$. We use induction with respect to i to prove that xRb_i. This statement is true for $i = 0$ and let us suppose that xRb_{i-1}. If b_iRx, then the transitivity of R imply b_iRb_{i-1} — a contradiction. Thus, xRb_i for any $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ and, in particular, xRy' for $y' \in \bar{y}$. Using the above argumentation for R^{-1} (which is also reflexive and transitive) and taking into account that $E_R = E_{R^{-1}}$, we obtain that xRy and $x' \in \bar{x}$ yield $x'Ry$. Thus, if xRy, $x' \in \bar{x}$, and $y' \in \bar{y}$, then $x'Ry'$.

Theorem 2.2.3 *Let the binary relation* R *on* A *be reflexive and transitive, let* $F = P_R$ *be its asymmetric part, and let* $E_F^{(t)}$ *be the transitive closure of the indifference* E_F*. One has:*

(i) *The relation* R *is weakly* $E_F^{(t)}$*-saturated.*

(ii) *The week factor-relation* R' *on the factor-set* $A' = A/E_F^{(t)}$ *is reflexive, transitive, antisymmetric, and complete;* A' *endowed with* R' *is a linearly ordered set.*

Proof: We remind that xE_Fy means x and y are not F-comparable.

(i) Let xRy and $xE_F^{(t)}x'$.

Case 1. $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$.

In this case $yE_F^{(t)}x'$ and it is enough to note that $x'Rx'$.

Case 2. $\bar{x} \neq \bar{y}$.

Proposition 2.2.2, (ii), shows that x and y are R-comparable and if xRy, then, in particular, for any $x' \in \bar{x}$ there exists $y' \in \bar{y}$ such that $x'Rx'$.

(ii) The weak factor-relation R' on the factor-set A' is reflexive and transitive because of Proposition 2.1.2, (i), (ii). In accord with Proposition 2.2.2, (ii), if $\bar{x} \neq \bar{y}$, then x and y are R-comparable, say xRy, and we obtain $\bar{x}R'\bar{y}$. Therefore the week factor-relation R' on A' is complete. Let $\bar{x}R'\bar{y}$ and $\bar{y}R'\bar{x}$. If we suppose $\bar{x} \neq \bar{y}$, then Proposition 2.2.2, (ii), yields xRy and yRx which contradicts the asymmetry of R. Thus, $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$ and R' is an antisymmetric relation. In other words, R' is a linear order on A'.

2.3 Coproducts of preordered sets

Here we remind the definition of coproduct of a family $(A_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$ of sets (see, for example [2, Ch. II, Sec. 4, n^o 8]) and endow this coproduct with a structure of preordered set, given such structures on the members A_ι of the family and given a structure of partially ordered set on the index set I.

For any $\iota \in I$ there exists a bijection $A_\iota \to A_\iota \times \{\iota\}$, $x \mapsto (x, \iota)$. The set $A = \cup_{\iota \in I}(A_\iota \times \{\iota\})$ is called the *coproduct* of the family $(A_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$. Let $U = \cup_{\iota \in I} A_\iota$

be the union of this family. In case $A_\iota \cap A_\kappa = \emptyset$ for any $\iota \neq \kappa$ there exists a projection $\pi\colon U \to I$, $x \mapsto \iota$, where $x \in A_\iota$. We have a bijection between the union U and the coproduct A, given by the rule

$$U \to A,\ x \mapsto (x, \pi(x)).$$

When the family $(A_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$ has pairwise disjoint members we identify the union U and the coproduct A via the above bijection and define the *projection* $\pi\colon A \to I$, $x \mapsto \iota$, where $x \in A_\iota$.

Below, when discussing the coproduct of a family of sets, we implicitly suppose without any loss of generality that the members of this family are pairwise disjoint. In other words, "coproduct" is a shorthand for "union of pairwise disjoint sets".

Let A be a non-empty set. In accord with Proposition 1.2.3, the symmetric part I_R of a preorder R on A is an equivalence relation and its asymmetric part P_R is an asymmetric and transitive relation.

Proposition 2.3.1 *Let $(A_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$ be a family of preordered sets, let $(R_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$ be the family of the corresponding preorders, and let the index set I be partially ordered. Let $A = \coprod_{\iota \in I} A_\iota$ be the coproduct of the family $(A_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$, let $\pi\colon A \to I$, $x \mapsto \iota$ if $x \in A_\iota$, be the natural projection, and let $\mathcal{E}$ be the equivalence relation associated with the partition $(A_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$ of the coproduct A.*

(i) *The coproduct A of this family has a structure of preordered set given by the formula*

$$xRy \text{ if } \pi(x) < \pi(y) \text{ or } \pi(x) = \pi(y) \text{ and } xR_{\pi(x)}y \text{ in } A_{\pi(x)},$$

where $<$ is the asymmetric part of the partial order $\leq$ on I.

(ii) *One has*

$$xI_Ry \text{ if and only if } \pi(x) = \pi(y) \text{ and } xI_{R_{\pi(x)}}y \text{ in } A_{\pi(x)}.$$

(iii) *One has*

$$xP_Ry \text{ if and only if } \pi(x) < \pi(y) \text{ or } \pi(x) = \pi(y) \text{ and } xP_{R_{\pi(x)}}y \text{ in } A_{\pi(x)}.$$

Let, in addition, $(A_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$ be a family of bubbles. Then one has:

(iv) *xP_Ry if and only if $\pi(x) < \pi(y)$.*

(v) *The asymmetric part P_R of the preorder R is $\mathcal{E}$-saturated.*

Proof: (i) We have xRx because $xR_\iota x$ for $\iota = \pi(x)$. Now, let xRy and yRz. We obtain $\pi(x) \leq \pi(y)$ and $\pi(y) \leq \pi(z)$, hence $\pi(x) \leq \pi(z)$. If $\pi(x) < \pi(z)$, then xRz. Otherwise, there exists $\iota \in I$ such that $\iota = \pi(x) = \pi(y) = \pi(z)$, $xR_\iota y$, and $yR_\iota z$. Therefore $xR_\iota z$ and this yields xRz.

(ii) We have xRy and yRx if and only if there exists $\iota \in I$ such that $\pi(x) = \pi(y) = \iota$, $xR_\iota y$, and $yR_\iota x$.

(iii) This is an immediate consequence of parts (i) and (ii).

(iv) We have $P_{R_{\pi(x)}} = \emptyset$ because of Proposition 1.2.2, (ii). Now, part (iii) yields that xP_Ry is equivalent to $\pi(x) < \pi(y)$.

(v) If $x'\mathcal{E}x$ and $y\mathcal{E}y'$ (that is, $x' \in A_{\pi(x)}$ and $y' \in A_{\pi(y)}$), then $x'P_Ry'$ because of part (iv) .

The set A of the coproduct of a family $(A_\iota)_{\iota\in I}$ of preordered sets, whose index set I is partially ordered, endowed with the structure of preordered set from Proposition 2.3.1, (i), is said to be the *coproduct of the preordered sets* (A_ι)*,* $\iota \in I$, or the *coproduct of the family* $(A_\iota)_{\iota\in I}$ *of preordered sets.*

We note that part (i) of the above proposition is a generalization of [2, Ch. 3, Sec. 1, Exercise 3, a].

2.4 Interval topology of coproduct of a family of bubbles

Here we use freely the terminology, notation, and results from subsection 2.3 as well as from [3, Ch. I]).

Let A be a preordered set and R be its preorder. Let us set $E = I_R$ and $F = P_R$. An *open interval in* A is any subset J of A of the form

$$J = (x, y)_A = \{z \in A \mid xFz \text{ and } zFy\},$$

or

$$J = (\leftarrow, x)_A = \{z \in A \mid zFx\},$$

or

$$J = (x, \rightarrow)_A = \{z \in A \mid xFz\},$$

where $x, y \in A$. The *interval topology* $\mathcal{T}_0(A)$ on A is the topology generated by the set $\mathcal{O}_A$ of all open intervals in A, that is, $U \in \mathcal{T}_0(A)$ (U is *open*) if U is a union of finite intersections of open intervals in A. In particular, the open intervals are open sets in the interval topology. In case A is a linearly ordered set, any finite intersection of open intervals is an open interval, hence the set $\mathcal{O}_A$ is a base of the topology of A.

We remind that a topological space A is said to be *separable* if there is a countable subset $D \subset A$ such that $D \cap U \neq \emptyset$ for any non-empty open subset $U \subset A$. In order to prove separability, it is enough to check the inequality $D \cap U \neq \emptyset$ for any non-empty member U of a base of the topology of A.

Theorem 2.4.1 *Under the conditions of Proposition 2.3.1, let the index set* I *be linearly ordered, let* $(A_\iota)_{\iota\in I}$ *be a family of bubbles, and let* A *and* I *be endowed with their interval topologies.*

(i) *The natural projection* $\pi\colon A \to I$ *is a strictly increasing map which induces a pair of mutually inverse bijections*

$$\mathcal{O}_A \to \mathcal{O}_I,\ J \mapsto \pi(J), \tag{2.4.1}$$

and

$$\mathcal{O}_I \to \mathcal{O}_A,\ K \mapsto \pi^{-1}(K). \tag{2.4.2}$$

(ii) *The set* $\mathcal{O}_A$ *is a base of the topology of* A*.*

(iii) $\pi\colon A \to I$ *is a continuous and open map.*

Proof: Let $F = P_R$ be the asymmetric part of the preorder R on the coproduct A.

(i) According to Proposition 2.3.1, (iv), the relations xFy and $\pi(x) < \pi(y)$ are equivalent. Therefore π is a strictly increasing map and any open interval J in A is $\mathcal{E}$-saturated. Moreover, π maps any open interval J in A into an open interval K in I whose endpoint(s) is (are) the image(s) of the endpoint(s) of J. Since the sets A_ι, $\iota \in I$, are not empty, the natural projection π is a surjective map and we have $\pi(J) = K$. On the other hand, the inverse image $\pi^{-1}(K)$ of an open interval K in I is an open interval in A with endpoint(s) chosen to be inverse image(s) of the endpoint(s) of K. Thus, the existence of the maps (2.4.1) and (2.4.2) is justified. In accord with (2.4.1), $\pi(\pi^{-1}(K)) = K$ and the $\mathcal{E}$-saturation of the open intervals J in A yields $J = \pi^{-1}(\pi(J))$.

(ii) It is enough to show that a finite intersection of open intervals in A is an open interval. For let $J_\lambda \in \mathcal{O}_A$, $\lambda = 1, \ldots, s$ and let $K_\lambda \in \mathcal{O}_I$ be such that $J_\lambda = \pi^{-1}(K_\lambda)$ (part (i), (2.4.2)). Since I is a linearly ordered set, the intersection $K = \cap_{\lambda=1}^{s} K_\lambda$ is an open interval in I and we have

$$\pi^{-1}(K) = \pi^{-1}(\cap_{\lambda=1}^{s} K_\lambda) = \cap_{\lambda=1}^{s} \pi^{-1}(K_\lambda) = \cap_{\lambda=1}^{s} J_\lambda.$$

Now, part (i), (2.4.2), yields that $\cap_{\lambda=1}^{s} J_\lambda \in \mathcal{O}_A$.

(iii) Since the set $\mathcal{O}_I$ is a base of the topology of the loset I, part (i), (2.4.2), assures that π is a continuous map. On the other hand, part (i), (2.4.1), and part (ii) imply that π is an open map. Indeed, if the set U is open in A, then $U = \cup_{\lambda \in L} J_\lambda$ for some family $(J_\lambda)_{\lambda \in L}$ of open intervals in A. We have

$$\pi(U) = \pi(\cup_{\lambda \in L} J_\lambda) = \cup_{\lambda \in L} \pi(J_\lambda)$$

and $\pi(J_\lambda)$ are open intervals in I because of (2.4.1).

Corollary 2.4.2 (i) *The topology of A is the inverse image via π of the topology of I.*

(ii) *The topological space A is connected if and only if the topological space I is connected.*

(iii) *The topological space A is separable if and only if the topological space I is separable and the countable dense subsets $D \subset A$, $D' \subset I$ can be chosen such that $\pi(D) = D'$.*

Proof: (i) Theorem 2.4.1, (ii) implies immediately that $\mathcal{T}_0(A) = \{\pi^{-1}(V) \mid V \in \mathcal{T}_0(I)$.

(ii) According to Theorem 2.4.1, (iii), the surjective map $\pi\colon A \to I$ is continuous, hence the connectedness of A implies the connectedness of I (see [3, Ch. I, Sec. 11, n^o, Proposition 4]. Now, let I be a connected topological space and let us suppose that A is not connected. In other words, there exist two open non-empty and disjoint subsets U and U' of A, such that $A = U \cup U'$. Theorem 2.4.1, (ii), yields that $U = \cup_{\lambda \in L} J_\lambda$ and $U' = \cup_{\mu \in M} J'_\mu$ for some non-empty families $(J_\lambda)_{\lambda \in L}$, $(J'_\mu)_{\mu \in M}$ of open intervals in A. Let $(K_\lambda)_{\lambda \in L}$, $(K'_\mu)_{\mu \in M}$ be the families of open intervals in I, such that $J_\lambda = \pi^{-1}(K_\lambda)$ and $J'_\mu = \pi^{-1}(K'_\mu)$.

We have $\pi(U) = \cup_{\lambda \in L} K_\lambda$, $\pi(U') = \cup_{\mu \in M} K'_\mu$, and $I = \pi(U) \cup \pi(U')$. Since I is a connected topological space, the non-empty open sets $\pi(U)$ and $\pi(U')$ are not disjoint, that is, there exist indices $\lambda \in L$ and $\mu \in M$ with $K_\lambda \cap K'_\mu \neq \emptyset$. We have $J_\lambda \cap J'_\mu = \pi^{-1}(K_\lambda \cap K'_\mu)$ and the surjectivity of π implies $J_\lambda \cap J'_\mu \neq \emptyset$ — a contradiction with $U \cap U' = \emptyset$. Therefore A is connected.

(iii) Let A be separable and let D be a countable subset of A which meets every non-empty open interval J in A. Then in accord with Theorem 2.4.1, (i), the countable image $D' = \pi(D)$ meets any non-empty open interval K in I.

Now, let I be a separable topological space and let $D' \subset I$ be a countable subset such that $D' \cap K \neq \emptyset$ for any non-empty open interval K in I. Using the axiom of choice, we fix an element $d \in \pi^{-1}(d')$ for any $d' \in D'$. The subset $D \subset A$ of all $d \in A$ just chosen is countable and Theorem 2.4.1, (i), assures that D meets every non-empty open interval J in A. Moreover, $D' = \pi(D)$. Thus, A is separable.

3 Characterization of the negative transitivity

> Right is right even if no one is doing it; wrong is wrong even if everyone is doing it.
>
> *Saint Augustine of Hippo*

This section is the core of the paper. Here we give a complete characterization of the preordered sets A whose preorder has negatively transitive asymmetric part. As a consequence of this characterization we prove the existence of a generalized continuous utility function on A under the condition that the topological space A is connected and separable.

3.1 The necessary condition

Theorem 3.1.1 *Let R be a preorder on the set A and let its asymmetric part $F = P_R$ be negatively transitive. Then one has:*

(i) *The relation E_R is symmetric and $\mathcal{E} = E_F$ is an equivalence relation on A.*

(ii) *$\mathcal{E} = E \cup E_R$, where $E = I_R$ is the symmetric part of R.*

(iii) *The relation F is $\mathcal{E}$-saturated.*

(iv) *The relation E is weakly $\mathcal{E}$-saturated.*

(v) *The relation R is weakly $\mathcal{E}$-saturated.*

Let $A' = A/\mathcal{E}$ be the factor-set and let R' and $\bar{F}$ be the weak factor-relation of R and the factor-relation of F with respect to the equivalence relation $\mathcal{E}$. Then:

(vi) *$R' = D_{A'} \cup \bar{F}$ and $D_{A'} \cap \bar{F} = \emptyset$.*

(vii) *R' is a reflexive, transitive, antisymmetric, and complete binary relation on A' with asymmetric part $\bar{F}$ and the factor-set A' endowed with R' is a linearly ordered set.*

Proof: (i) Proposition 1.2.3, (i), and Proposition 2.1.10 assure that E_R is symmetric and E_F is an equivalence relation on A.

(ii) Using Proposition 1.2.1, (ii), (iii), we have $\mathcal{E} = E_F = (F \cup F^{-1})^c = F^c \cap (F^c)^{-1} = (R^c \cup R^{-1}) \cap ((R^c)^{-1} \cup R) = I_{R^c} \cup I_R = E_R \cup I_R$.

(iii) Since F is asymmetric and negatively transitive, Proposition 2.1.10, (ii), yields that F is $\mathcal{E}$-saturated.

(iv) This is a consequence of Lemma 2.1.1.

(v) Part (iii) implies that F is weakly $\mathcal{E}$-saturated. Since the union of weakly $\mathcal{E}$-saturated binary relations is weakly $\mathcal{E}$-saturated and since $R = E \cup F$, we obtain that R is weakly $\mathcal{E}$-saturated.

(vi) Using parts (ii), (iii), and (iv), we obtain $R' = E' \cup F' = D_{A'} \cup \bar{F}$. If $D_{A'} \cap \bar{F} \neq \emptyset$, then there exists $x \in A$ with $\bar{x}\bar{F}\bar{x}$. In particular, there exists $x' \in \bar{x}$ such that xFx'. The saturation of F with respect to $\mathcal{E}$ yields xFx and this contradicts $E \cap F = \emptyset$. Therefore $D_{A'} \cap \bar{F} = \emptyset$.

(vii) The weak factor-relation R' is reflexive because of part (vi). Proposition 2.1.2, (ii), yields the transitivity of R'. Now, let xRy, yRz, and $x\mathcal{E}z$. Using the transitivity of R, we obtain xRz, and, in particular, xE_R^cz, hence xEz. In accord with Proposition 2.1.6, (ii), the relation R is E-saturated. Now, yRz and zEx imply yRx and this, in turn, produces xEy, hence $x\mathcal{E}y$. Thus, R satisfies the condition (2.1.1) and this together with Proposition 2.1.2, (iii), implies that R' is an antisymmetric relation. Now, we will prove the completeness of R'. Let $\bar{x} \neq \bar{y}$. Then xE^cy, xE_R^cy and let us suppose, for example, that xRy. For $x' \in \bar{x}$ we have similarly $x'E^cy$ and $x'E_R^cy$. If $x'Ex$, then $x'Ry$. Now, let $x'E_Rx$. Taking into account that xRy, the possibility yRx' implies xRx' — a contradiction. Therefore $x'Ry$ and this means $\bar{x}R'\bar{y}$. According to Proposition 1.1.2, (ii), the relation F is transitive and Proposition 2.1.2, (ii), in turn, assures that $F' = \bar{F}$ is transitive. If $\bar{x}\bar{F}\bar{y}$ and $\bar{y}\bar{F}\bar{x}$, then $\bar{x}R'\bar{y}$ and $\bar{y}R'\bar{x}$, and the antisymmetry of R' implies $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$ — a contradiction with part (vi). Therefore the relation $\bar{F}$ on A' is asymmetric and Proposition 2.1.8, applied for the decomposition of R' from part (vi), yields that $P_{R'} = \bar{F}$.

3.2 The sufficient condition

In the context of Theorem 3.1.1, let $\pi\colon A \to A'$ be the canonical surjective map from A to the linearly ordered factor-set $A' = A/\mathcal{E}$. The inverse images $A_\iota = \pi^{-1}(\iota)$, $\iota \in A'$, (the *fibres* of π) are exactly the $\mathcal{E}$-equivalence classes and since $E \subset \mathcal{E}$, any inverse image A_ι is E-saturated. In particular, the equivalence relation $E = I_R$ induces on any fibre A_ι an equivalence relation E_ι. In other words, all fibres of π are bubbles. Moreover, A is equal to the coproduct $\coprod_{\iota \in A'} A_\iota$ and since the relation xFy is equivalent to the inequality $\pi(x) < \pi(y)$, we have xRy if and only if "$\pi(x) < \pi(y)$" or "$\pi(x) = \pi(y)$ and $xE_{\pi(x)}y$ in $A_{\pi(x)}$". Thus, any preordered set whose preorder has negatively transitive asymmetric part can be identified with the coproduct of a family of bubbles with linearly ordered index set.

Theorem 3.2.1 below shows that starting with a family of bubbles indexed with a linearly ordered set I, we can endow the coproduct A of this family with a preorder R such that its asymmetric part F is negatively transitive, the factor-order R' on the factor-set $A' = A/E_F$ is linear, and the loset A' is isomorphic to I.

Theorem 3.2.1 *Let $(A_\iota)_{\iota\in I}$ be a family of bubbles, let $(E_\iota)_{\iota\in I}$ be the family of the corresponding equivalence relations, and let the index set I be linearly ordered. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the equivalence relation on the coproduct $A = \coprod_{\iota\in I} A_\iota$, which corresponds to the partition $(A_\iota)_{\iota\in I}$, let $\pi\colon A \to I$, $x \mapsto \iota$, where $x \in A_\iota$, be the natural projection, and let R be the preorder on A from Proposition 2.3.1,* (i), *defined by the rule*

$$xRy \text{ if } \pi(x) < \pi(y) \text{ or } \pi(x) = \pi(y) \text{ and } xE_{\pi(x)}y \text{ in } A_{\pi(x)}.$$

(i) *The asymmetric part $F = P_R$ of R is negatively transitive and one has $\mathcal{E} = E_F$.*

(ii) *The relation R is weakly $\mathcal{E}$-saturated.*

(iii) *The factor-set $A' = A/\mathcal{E}$ endowed with the factor-relation R' is isomorphic to the linearly ordered set I.*

Proof: (i) Since $E_\iota = I_{E_\iota}$ for any $\iota \in I$ (see Proposition 1.2.2), using Proposition 2.3.1, (ii), we have

$$xI_Ry \text{ if and only if } \pi(x) = \pi(y) \text{ and } xE_{\pi(x)}y \text{ in } A_{\pi(x)}$$

and this implies

$$xFy \text{ if and only if } \pi(x) < \pi(y). \tag{3.2.1}$$

In particular, $E_F = \{(x, y) \in A \mid \pi(x) = \pi(y)\} = \mathcal{E}$.

Now, let xFz and let $y \in A$. Then $\pi(x) < \pi(z)$ and the linearity of I yields $\pi(x) < \pi(y)$ or $\pi(y) < \pi(z)$, that is xFy or yFz. In other words, the asymmetric part F of R is negatively transitive.

(ii) Part (i) and Theorem 3.1.1, (v), yield the statement.

(iii) Since π is a surjective map and since $\mathcal{E} = \{(x, y) \in A \mid \pi(x) = \pi(y)\}$, Proposition 2.1.2, (v), yields an increasing bijection $\pi'\colon A' \to I$ of linearly ordered sets, that is, an isomorphism between A' and I.

3.3 Existence of a continuous generalized utility function

Let A be a set, let R be a preorder on A with asymmetric part F, and let A be endowed with its interval topology. Let $\mathbb{R}$ be the set of real numbers. By a *generalized utility function* on A we mean a real function $u\colon A \to \mathbb{R}$ such that: (a) $u(x) < u(y)$ if and only if xFy; (b) $u(x) = u(y)$ if and only if $x\mathcal{E}y$, where $\mathcal{E} = E_F$ is the reflexive and symmetric relation "x and y are not F-comparable". In case F is negatively transitive, Theorem 3.1.1, (i), (ii), assure that $\mathcal{E}$ is an equivalence relation and, moreover, that condition (b) is equivalent to: (b$'$) $u(x) = u(y)$ if and only if "xRy and yRx" or "x and y are not R-comparable". When the preorder R is complete, condition (b$'$) has the form $u(x) = u(y)$ if and only if xRy and yRx, that is, u is the ordinary utility function.

In the lemma below we use freely the terminology and notation from Theorem 3.1.1 and Theorem 3.2.1.

We denote by U the set of the four intervals in $\mathbb{R}$ with endpoints 0 and 1.

Lemma 3.3.1 *Let A be a preordered set whose preorder R has a negatively transitive asymmetric part F, let $A = (A_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$ be the coproduct of the corresponding family of bubbles whose index set I, after the identification $I = A/\mathcal{E}$, is furnished with the linear factor-order, and let $\pi\colon A \to I$, $x \mapsto \iota$, where $x \in A_\iota$, be the natural projection. Let A and I be endowed with their interval topologies and let $\Lambda \in U$. The following two statements are then equivalent:*

(i) *There exists a surjective generalized (continuous) utility function $u\colon A \to \Lambda$.*

(ii) *There exists a strictly increasing surjective (continuous) map $u'\colon I \to \Lambda$.*

Parts (i), (ii) *with continuous u, u' imply:*

(iii) *There exists a homeomorphism $u'\colon I \to \Lambda$.*

If, in addition, I is connected, then (i), (ii) *with continuous u, u', and* (iii) *are equivalent.*

Proof: (i) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (ii) There exists a bijection between the maps $u\colon A \to \mathbb{R}$ which are constant on the members of the factor-set $I = A/\mathcal{E}$ and the maps $u'\colon I \to \mathbb{R}$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
A \arrow[d, "\pi"] \arrow[dr, "u"] & \\
I \arrow[r, "u'"] & \mathbb{R}
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative. The equivalence (3.2.1) shows that u is strictly increasing if and only if u' is strictly increasing. Moreover, since $\mathcal{E} = \{(x, y) \in A^2 \mid u(x) = u(y)\}$, Proposition 2.1.2, (v), implies that the map u' is a strictly increasing bijection. Theorem 2.4.1, (iii), and the commutativity of the above diagram ($u' = \pi \circ u$) assure that u is continuous if and only if u' is continuous.

(ii) $\Longrightarrow$ (iii)

Let $u'\colon I \to \Lambda$ be a strictly increasing surjective continuous map. Then u' is an isomorphism of posets and maps any open interval (x, y) in I onto the open interval $(f(x), f(y))$ in Λ. Thus, the bijection u' is a continuous and open map, hence its inverse $u'^{-1}\colon \Lambda \to I$ is a continuous map, too.

(ii) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (iii) Let u and u' be continuous. Under the condition of connectedness of I, this equivalence may be found in [3, Ch. IV, Sec. 2, Exercise 8 a] (see also Corollary A.2.20).

Let $\mathbb{Q}$ be the set of rational numbers.

Theorem 3.3.2 *Let A be a preordered set whose preorder has a negatively transitive asymmetric part. Let A be connected and has a countable dense subset D with respect to the interval topology on A. Then there exists a continuous generalized utility function u on A which maps the set A onto some interval $\Lambda \in U$ and its subset D onto the intersection $\Lambda \cap \mathbb{Q}$.*

Proof: Under the conditions of Lemma 3.3.1, Corollary 2.4.2, (ii), (iii), yields that the index set I is connected and separable with $D' = \pi(D)$ as a countable dense subset. Now, in accord with [3, Ch. IV, Sec. 2, Exercise 11 a] (proved here as Theorem A.2.24), there exist a interval $\Lambda \in U$ and a map $u' \colon I \to \Lambda$ which is an increasing homeomorphism of I onto Λ and maps D' onto the intersection $\Lambda \cap \mathbb{Q}$. Composing u' with the natural projection $\pi \colon A \to I$, we obtain a map $u \colon A \to \Lambda$ which according to Lemma 3.3.1 is the desired continuous generalized utility function.

A Appendix

A.1 Partially Ordered sets: Miscellaneous Results

Let A be a set. The set $\mathcal{PO}(A)$ consisting of all partial orders $R \subset A^2$ on A with the relation $R \subset R'$ (that is, inclusion of partial orders) is a poset. Any linear order R on A is a maximal element of the poset $\mathcal{PO}(A)$ because if $(x, y) \notin R$, then $(y, x) \in R$.

Lemma A.1.1 *If R is a non-linear partial order on the set A and if $a, b \in A$ is a pair such that $(a, b) \notin R$ and $(b, a) \notin R$, then there exists a partial order R' which extends R and contains (a, b).*

Proof: We set

$$R_{(a,b)} = \{(x, y) \in A^2 \mid (x, a) \in R \text{ and } (b, y) \in R\},$$

and $R' = R \cup R_{(a,b)}$. Since $(a, b) \in R_{(a,b)}$ we have $R' \neq R$. The relation R' is reflexive since R is reflexive.

Now, let $(x, y) \in R'$ and $(y, x) \in R'$. The relations $(x, y) \in R_{(a,b)}$ and $(y, x) \in R_{(a,b)}$ mean $(x, a) \in R$, $(b, y) \in R$, $(y, a) \in R$, and $(b, x) \in R$, which in turn implies $(b, a) \in R$ — a contradiction. If, for example, $(x, y) \in R$ and $(y, x) \in R_{(a,b)}$, then $(y, a) \in R$ and $(b, x) \in R$. We have $(x, a) \in R$ and this yields $(b, a) \in R$ — again a contradiction. Thus, the relation R' is antisymmetric.

Let $(x, y) \in R'$ and $(y, z) \in R'$. The case $(x, y) \in R_{(a,b)}$ and $(y, z) \in R_{(a,b)}$ is impossible because $(b, y) \in R$ and $(y, a) \in R$ imply $(b, a) \in R$: a contradiction. Now, let $(x, y) \in R$ and $(y, z) \in R_{(a,b)}$. Then $(y, a) \in R$, $(b, z) \in R$, $(x, a) \in R$, and this yields $(x, z) \in R_{(a,b)}$. In the case $(x, y) \in R_{(a,b)}$ and $(y, z) \in R$ we have $(x, a) \in R$, $(b, y) \in R$, $(b, z) \in R$, hence $(x, z) \in R$.

We obtain immediately

Corollary A.1.2 *Any non-linear partial order on a set is not maximal.*

Theorem A.1.3 (E. Szpilrajn) *Let A be set. Any partial order on A can be extended to a linear order on A.*

Proof: Let R be a partial order on A and let us consider the non-empty set $\mathcal{E}(R) \subset \mathcal{PO}(A)$ consisting of all partial orders that extend R. The partial order in $\mathcal{PO}(A)$ induces a partial order on $\mathcal{E}(R)$ and let $C \subset \mathcal{E}(R)$ be a chain.

The union U=$\cup_{S\in C}S$ is a partial order that extends R, that is, $U \in \mathcal{E}(R)$, and, moreover, U is an upper bound of C. Therefore $\mathcal{E}(R)$ is an inductively ordered poset and Kuratowski-Zorn theorem yields that there exists a maximal element $M \in \mathcal{E}(R)$. If the order M is not linear, then Lemma A.1.1 produces a contradiction.

Let A and A' be posets. *Isomorphism of posets* is a bijection $f\colon A \to A'$ such that the relations $x \leq y$ and $f(x) \leq f(y)$ are equivalent.

Proposition A.1.4 *Let A be a linearly ordered set, and let B be a poset. Every strictly monotonic map $f\colon A \to B$ is injective; if f is strictly increasing, then f is an isomorphism of A and $f(A)$.*

Proof: Indeed, $x \neq y$ implies $x < y$ or $x > y$, hence $f(x) < f(y)$ or $f(x) > f(y)$, and in all cases $f(x) \neq f(y)$. Finally, $f(x) \leq f(y)$ implies $x \leq y$: otherwise we would have $x > y$ and then $f(x) > f(y)$: a contradiction.

Proposition A.1.5 *Let A and B be posets and let $f\colon A \to B$ be a bijection. Then f is an isomorphism of posets if and only if f and its inverse f^{-1} are increasing maps, and under this condition f and f^{-1} are strictly increasing maps.*

Proof: The "only if" part is immediate. Now, let f and its inverse f^{-1} be increasing maps. The relation $x \leq y$ in A implies $f(x) \leq f(y)$ in B. The relation $x' \leq y'$ in B implies $f^{-1}(x') \leq f^{-1}(y')$ in A, and it is enough to set $x' = f(x)$ and $y' = f(y)$. Now, let f be an isomorphism of posets. Then $x < y$ implies $f(x) \leq f(y)$ and if $f(x) = f(y)$, then $x = y$: a contradiction. Therefore $f(x) < f(y)$.

Lemma A.1.6 *Let A be a linearly preordered set. Then the intersection of any finite family of open intervals in A is an open interval in A.*

Proof: Let $((a_\iota, b_\iota))_{\iota\in I}$ be a finite family of open intervals. Let a be the greatest element of the finite family $(a_\iota)_{\iota\in I}$ and let b be the least element of the finite family $(b_\iota)_{\iota\in I}$. Note that $a =\leftarrow$ if $a_\iota =\leftarrow$ for all $\iota \in I$ and $b =\rightarrow$ if $b_\iota =\rightarrow$ for all $\iota \in I$. Then we have

$$\cap_{\iota\in I}(a_\iota, b_\iota) = (a, b).$$

Theorem A.1.7 (G. Cantor) *Let A and B be countable linearly ordered sets that have least elements and greatest elements.*

(i) *If B is without gaps, then there exists a strictly increasing map $f\colon A \to B$.*

(ii) *If A and B are without gaps, then the map f from part* (i) *is an isomorphism of posets.*

Proof: (i) We set $A = \{a_1, a_2, \ldots,\}$ and $B = \{b_1, b_2, \ldots,\}$ and without any loss of generality we can suppose that a_1, b_1 are the least and a_2, b_2 are the greatest elements of A and B. Further, we set $A_n = \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n\}$, $n \geq 2$. We define inductively a sequence of strictly increasing maps $(f_n\colon A_n \to B)_{n\geq 2}$ such that for any n the map f_n is an extension of f_{n-1}. First we define a strictly increasing map $f_2\colon A_2 \to B$ by $f_2(a_1) = b_1$ and $f_2(a_2) = b_2$. Given $n \geq 3$, under the assumption that f_{n-1} is a strictly increasing map, we define f_n via the rule

$$f_n(a_n) = b_s, \tag{A.1.1}$$

where $s \geq 3$ is the minimal index such that f_n is a strictly increasing map. It is enough to show that there exists an index $s \geq 3$ that satisfies (A.1.1) and has the latter property. Let a_i be the immediate predecessor and a_j be the immediate successor of a_n in the finite poset A_n. We have $f_{n-1}(a_i) < f_{n-1}(a_j)$ and since the open interval $I = (f_{n-1}(a_i), f_{n-1}(a_j))$ is not empty, each $b_s \in I$ works. The sequence $(f_n)_{n\geq 2}$, in turn, defines a strictly increasing map $f\colon A \to B$ by the formula $f(a_n) = f_m(a_n)$ for some $m \geq n$.

(ii) It is enough to prove that for any integer $p \geq 2$ we have $b_k \in \mathrm{Im}(f)$ for all $k < p$. This statement is true for $p = 2$. Now, let $p \geq 3$, let us suppose that the statement is true for all integers $< p$, and let us choose $n \geq 2$ such that $b_1, \ldots, b_{p-1} \in f_n(A_n)$. Let us suppose that $b_p \notin f_n(A_n)$, let b_ι be the immediate predecessor, b_κ be the immediate successor of b_p in the finite poset $f_n(A_n)$, and let $f_n(a_i) = b_\iota$, $f_n(a_j) = b_\kappa$. We have $A_n \cap (a_i, a_j) = \emptyset$ and choose m to be the minimal index such that $a_m \in (a_i, a_j)$. Then $m > n$, $A_m \cap (a_i, a_j) = \{a_m\}$, and, in particular, a_i is the immediate predecessor and a_j is the immediate successor of a_m in the finite poset A_m. Moreover, p is the minimal index with $b_p \in (f_n(a_i), f_n(a_j))$. In accord with the definition of the map f from part (i), we have $f(a_m) = f_m(a_m) = b_p$. Thus, our statement is true for $p + 1$ and the principle of mathematical induction yields it for all $p \geq 2$.

Corollary A.1.8 *For any countable linearly ordered set A there exists a strictly increasing map $f\colon A \to [0,1]_{\mathbb{Q}}$. If, in addition, A is without gaps, then:*

(i) *The map f establishes an isomorphism between A and the interval $[0,1]_{\mathbb{Q}}$ if and only if A has a least element and a greatest element.*

(ii) *The map f establishes an isomorphism between A and the interval $[0,1)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ if and only if A has least element but has no greatest element.*

(iii) *The map f establishes an isomorphism between A and the interval $(0,1]_{\mathbb{Q}}$ if and only if A has a greatest element but has no least element.*

(iv) *The map f establishes an isomorphism between A and $(0,1)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ if and only if A has no least element and no greatest element.*

Proof: The existence of a strictly increasing map $f\colon A \to [0,1]_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is ensured by Theorem A.1.7, (i). The necessity part of the equivalences in (i) – (iv) is immediate.

(i) Note that the interval $[0,1]_{\mathbb{Q}}$ has least element 0, greatest element 1, has no gaps, and then use Theorem A.1.7, (ii).

(ii) We adjoint a greatest element γ to A, thus obtaining $A' = A \oplus \{\gamma\}$, use part (i) for A', and then restrict the corresponding isomorphism on A.

(iii) We adjoint a least element λ to A, thus obtaining $A' = \{\lambda\} \oplus A$, use part (i) for A', and then restrict the corresponding isomorphism on A.

(iv) We adjoint a greatest element γ and a least element λ to A, thus obtaining $A'' = \{\lambda\} \oplus A \oplus \{\gamma\}$, use part (i) for A'', and then restrict the corresponding isomorphism on A.

Using Corollary A.1.8, (iv), twice we obtain

Corollary A.1.9 *Every countable subset of the open interval* $(0,1)_{\mathbb{R}}$*, which is dense in this interval, is isomorphic to* $\mathbb{Q}$*.*

Combining Theorem A.1.3 and Corollary A.1.8 we obtain

Corollary A.1.10 *Given a countable partially ordered set* A*, there exists a strictly increasing map of* A *into* $\mathbb{Q}$*.*

Corollary A.1.11 *If* A *is a countable linearly ordered set* A *without gaps, then there exists a bounded from above subset* B *of* A*, which has no least upper bound in* A*.*

Proof: Let $f\colon A \to [0,1]_{\mathbb{Q}}$ be a strictly increasing map with image I which coincides with one of the four intervals in the rational line $\mathbb{Q}$ with endpoints 0 and 1. The existence of f is assured by Corollary A.1.8. Let $J = I \cap (0, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2})_{\mathbb{R}}$ and let $B = f^{-1}(J)$. Since the subset J of I has no least upper bound in I, the subset B of A has no least upper bound in A.

A.2 Interval Topology: Connectedness

Let A be a preordered set with preorder $\preceq$ and let $\sim$ be its symmetric part. The set A can be endowed with topology such that the open intervals are open sets in this topology. The coarser topology on X with this property is the topology generated by the open intervals (bounded or unbounded) in X, which is called *interval* topology and denoted by $\mathcal{T}_0(A)$. Moreover, the closed intervals (bounded and unbounded) are closed sets in this topology. In particular, the equivalence classes $C_x = [x,x]$ with respect to $\sim$ are closed sets. In case A is a linearly preordered set, Lemma A.1.6 yields that the open intervals form a base of the interval topology $\mathcal{T}_0(A)$.

A closed interval $[x,y]$ with $x \prec y$ is said to be a *gap* in A if $[x,y] = \{x,y\}$, that is, the open interval (x,y) is empty.

We use the same terminology and notation for a partially ordered set A.

Examples A.2.1 (1) The natural topology of the real line $\mathbb{R}$ coincides with its interval topology $\mathcal{T}_0(\mathbb{R})$. The (countable) set of all open intervals with rational endpoints is a base of this topology and the trace of this set on $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is by definition the natural base of the interval top[ology $\mathcal{T}_0(\mathbb{Q})$ on the rational line $\mathbb{Q}$. In particular, the topology of $\mathbb{Q}$ as a subspace of the real line $\mathbb{R}$ coincides with its interval topology $\mathcal{T}_0(\mathbb{Q})$.

(2) The natural topology of any interval I in the real line $\mathbb{R}$, that is, the topology on I, considered as a subspace of $\mathbb{R}$, coincides with its interval topology $\mathcal{T}_0(I)$ because the trace of any open interval in $\mathbb{R}$ on I is an open interval in I.

(3) The natural topology of any interval J in the rational line $\mathbb{Q}$, that is, the topology on J, considered as a subspace of $\mathbb{Q}$, coincides with its interval topology $\mathcal{T}_0(J)$ because the trace of any open interval in $\mathbb{Q}$ on J is an open interval in J. In accord with Example (1), any open interval J in the rational line $\mathbb{Q}$ with its natural topology is a subspace of the real line $\mathbb{R}$, too.

(4) Given a natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $A = [0,1]_{\mathbb{Q}}$,

$$F_n = \{(\frac{1}{i}, \frac{1}{j}) \in \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q} \mid i, j \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq j < i \leq n\} \cup \{(0, \frac{1}{i}) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq i \leq n\},$$

and $D = \{(a,b) \in A \times A \mid a = b\}$. The set F_n is an asymmetric and transitive binary relation on A and $R_n = D \cup F_n$ is a reflexive and transitive binary relation on A, that is, a partial order on A, with asymmetric part F_n. We denote by A_n the set A endowed with the partial order R_n. Every member of F_n, that is, an ordered pair of the form $(\frac{1}{i}, \frac{1}{j})$, $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq j < i \leq n$, or $(0, \frac{1}{i})$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, defines an open interval in the interval topology $\mathcal{T}_0(A_n)$:

$$(\frac{1}{i}, \frac{1}{j})_{A_n} = \{a \in A \mid (\frac{1}{i}, a) \in F_n \text{ and } (a, \frac{1}{j}) \in F_n\},$$

and

$$(0, \frac{1}{i})_{A_n} = \{a \in A \mid (0, a) \in F_n \text{ and } (a, \frac{1}{i}) \in F_n\},$$

respectively. Every element of the family $\mathbb{F}_n$ of open intervals thus obtained has the form

$$(\frac{1}{i}, \frac{1}{j})_{A_n} = \{\frac{1}{k} \mid \frac{1}{i} < \frac{1}{k} < \frac{1}{j} \text{ and } k \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq k \leq n\},$$

and

$$(0, \frac{1}{i})_{A_n} = \{\frac{1}{k} \mid \frac{1}{k} < \frac{1}{i} \text{ and } k \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq k \leq n\}.$$

In particular, the closed intervals $[0, \frac{1}{n}]_{A_n}$ and $[\frac{1}{j+1}, \frac{1}{j}]_{A_n}$, $1 \leq j \leq n-1$, are all gaps in the partially ordered set A_n.

Since the intersection of any finite number of members of the family $\mathbb{F}_n$ is again a member of $\mathbb{F}_n$, we obtain that the finite family $\mathbb{F}_n$ is a base of the interval topology $\mathcal{T}_0(A_n)$. On the other hand, any union of members of $\mathbb{F}_n$ equals a finite union of disjoint members of $\mathbb{F}_n$. Therefore the interval topology $\mathcal{T}_0(A_n)$ is a finite set consisting of finite unions of disjoint members of $\mathbb{F}_n$. In particular, all open sets different from A_n are finite and all closed sets different from the empty set $\emptyset$ are infinite (and countable), which implies that A_n is a connected topological space.

(5) We set $F_\infty = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n$, where F_n are the asymmetric and transitive binary relations on $A = [0,1]_{\mathbb{Q}}$ from Example (2) and $R_\infty = D \cup F_\infty$. The set F_∞ is an asymmetric and transitive binary relation on A and R_∞ is a partial order on A with asymmetric part F_∞.

Proposition A.2.2 *Let A and A' be partially ordered sets endowed with interval topology.*

(i) *If $f \colon A \to A'$ is an isomorphism of posets, then f is a homeomorphism.*

(ii) *Let A be a linearly ordered set and $f \colon A \to A'$ be a strictly increasing map with image $C \subset A'$. If the topology of C induced from A' coincides with its interval topology, then f is a homeomorphism of A onto the chain C considered as a subspace of A'.*

Proof: (i) In accord with Proposition A.1.5, f and its inverse f^{-1} are strictly increasing maps. Therefore

$$f((x,y)) = (f(x), f(y)), \text{ and } f^{-1}((x',y')) = (f^{-1}(x'), f^{-1}(y'))$$

for any open interval $(x,y) \subset A$ and any open interval $(x',y') \subset A'$. Thus, the map f (respectively, f^{-1}) maps the sub(base) of the topological space A (respectively, A') onto the (sub)base of the topological space A' (respectively, A) and therefore f is a homeomorphism.

(ii) According to Proposition A.1.4, $f \colon A \to C$ is an isomorphism of posets. If $U' \subset A'$ is open, then the trace $U' \cap C$ is open in C and hence $f^{-1}(U') = f^{-1}(U' \cap C)$ is an open set in A because of part (i).

The map

$$f \colon \mathbb{R} \to (-1,1)_{\mathbb{R}},\ x \mapsto \frac{x}{1+|x|},$$

is a strictly increasing bijection and the map

$$g \colon (-1,1)_{\mathbb{R}} \to (0,1)_{\mathbb{R}},\ x \mapsto 2\frac{x+1}{x+3},$$

is a strictly increasing bijection. Thus, the composition $h = g \circ f$,

$$h \colon \mathbb{R} \to (0,1)_{\mathbb{R}},\ x \mapsto \frac{x+1+|x|}{x+3+3|x|},$$

is a strictly increasing bijection and in accord with Proposition A.1.4 h is an isomorphism of posets. The restriction

$$h_{|\mathbb{Q}} \colon \mathbb{Q} \to (0,1)_{\mathbb{Q}},\ x \mapsto \frac{x+1+|x|}{x+3+3|x|},$$

is a strictly increasing bijection and the same argument yields that it is an isomorphism of posets.

Proposition A.2.3 *Both bijections h and $h_{|\mathbb{Q}}$ are homeomorphisms of the corresponding sets endowed with the interval topology.*

Proof: We apply Proposition A.2.2.

Remarks A.2.4 (1) We note that the base of the interval topology on the underlying set A is invariant if we replace the poset A with its dual A^{op}. Therefore the dual poset structure produces the same interval topology $\mathcal{T}_0(A)$.

(2) Every statement formulated in terms of the structure of loset on A and the corresponding topological structure is equivalent to its dual statement.

(3) If the subset $B \subset A$ is endowed with the induced linear order, then the corresponding interval topology $\mathcal{T}_0(B)$ is, in general, weaker than the topology of B considered as a subspace of A (if $x \notin B$ or $y \notin B$, then the trace of the open interval $(x, y)_A$ on B is not necessarily an (open) interval in B).

Proposition A.2.5 *Let A be a linearly ordered set endowed with the interval topology and let $B \subset A$, $x, y \in A$, and $x < y$. If A is a set without gaps and $(x, y) \subset B$, then $x \in \bar{B}$ and $y \in \bar{B}$.*

Proof: Let I be an open interval that contains x (respectively, y). It is enough to consider intervals of the form $I = (a, b)$ with $a < x < b$ (respectively, $a < y < b$). We set $m = \min\{y, b\}$ (respectively, $M = \max\{x, a\}$). Since A is a set without gaps, the open interval (x, m) (respectively,(M, y)) is not empty and $(x, m) \subset B \cap I$ (respectively, $(M, y) \subset B \cap I$). In particular, $B \cap I \neq \emptyset$ and hence $x \in \bar{B}$ (respectively, $y \in \bar{B}$).

Corollary A.2.6 *If $z = \inf B$ or $z = \sup B$, then $z \in \bar{B}$.*

Proof: Let $z = \inf B$ (respectively, $z = \sup B$) and let $I = (a, b)$ be an open interval that contains z. Then there exists $x \in B$ with $z < x < b$ (respectively, $a < x < z$) and, in particular, $I \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Thus, $z \in \bar{B}$.

Proposition A.2.7 *Let A be a non-empty linearly ordered set equipped with the interval topology. The topological space A is compact if and only if any subset of A has a least upper bound and a greatest lower bound.*

Proof: Let A be a compact space and let B be a non-empty subset of A endowed with the induced linear order. Since B is filtered to the right, we can form the section filter of B, that is, the filter on B of base

$$\mathcal{B} = \{B_x \mid B_x = [x, \rightarrow)_B,\ x \in B\}$$

consisting of all closed right-unbounded intervals in B. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the filter generated by $\mathcal{B}$ when $\mathcal{B}$ is considered as a filter base on A. Note that the filter $\mathcal{G}$ is finer than the filter on A, generated by the filter base

$$\mathcal{A} = \{A_x \mid A_x = [x, \rightarrow)_A,\ x \in B\}.$$

Since A is compact, the filter $\mathcal{G}$ has a cluster point $a \in A$. Therefore a is a cluster point of the filter base $\mathcal{A}$ which consists of closed subsets of A; in particular $a \in A_x$ for all $x \in B$, that is, a is an upper bound of the set B. If b is an upper bound of B and $b < a$, then the open neighbourhood $(b, \rightarrow)$ of the point a does not contains elements of B, which is a contradiction. Hence $a \leq b$ for any upper bound b of B, that is, $a = \sup_A B$. The topological space A is still compact if we change the structure of the loset on A with its dual A^{op}. Then the latter statement means that any non-empty subset of A^{op} has a least upper bound, that is, any non-empty subset of A has a greatest lower bound. In particular, the whole set A has a least element m and a greatest element M. If $B = \emptyset$, then $\sup_A B = m$ and $\inf_A B = M$.

Conversely, let us suppose that any non-empty subset of A has a least upper bound and a greatest lower bound and let $\mathcal{F}$ be a filter on A. Let L be the set of all greatest lower bounds $\inf_A C$ of members C of the filter $\mathcal{F}$ and let $a = \sup_A L$. We will prove that a is a cluster point of $\mathcal{F}$. Let us suppose that there exists $C \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\sup_A C < a$. Then there exists $C' \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\sup_A C < \inf_A C'$, hence

$$\sup_A C \cap C' \leq \sup_A C < \inf_A C' \leq \inf_A C \cap C',$$

which is a contradiction because $C \cap C' \in \mathcal{F}$ and, in particular, $C \cap C' \neq \emptyset$. Thus, for any $C \in \mathcal{F}$ we have $a \in [\inf_A C, \sup_A C]$. If $\inf_A C_0 = \sup_A C_0$ for some $C_0 \in \mathcal{F}$, then $C_0 = \{x\}$, $x \in A$, and the filter $\mathcal{F}$ is the trivial ultrafilter $U(x)$. Since $x \in C$ for all $C \in \mathcal{F}$, we have $\inf_A C \leq x$ for all $C \in \mathcal{F}$. Therefore $a = \sup_A L \leq x$. On the other hand, $\{x\} \in \mathcal{F}$, so $x = \inf_A \{x\} \leq a$, hence $x = a$. Since the ultrafilter $\mathcal{F} = U(a)$ converges to a, the point a is a cluster point of $\mathcal{F}$. Now, let us consider the case when $\inf_A C < \sup_A C$ for all $C \in \mathcal{F}$. Let us suppose the existence of an element $C \in \mathcal{F}$ and an open interval I that contains a, such that $C \cap I = \emptyset$. If $I = (a', \rightarrow)$ (respectively, $I = (\leftarrow, a'')$) then $\sup_A C \leq a' < a$ (respectively, $a < a'' \leq \inf_A C$), which in both cases is a contradiction. Now, suppose that $I = (a', a'')$ where $a' < a''$. Then $C = C' \cup C''$, where $C' = C \cap (\leftarrow, a']$ and $C'' = C \cap [a'', \rightarrow)$. Since $a' < a$, there exists $D \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $a' < \inf D$. Now, the inequalities $\inf_A D \leq a < a''$ yield $C \cap D = C'' \cap D$ and, in particular, $\inf_A (C \cap D) \geq a'' > a$. On the other hand, $C \cap D \in \mathcal{F}$ implies $\inf_A (C \cap D) \leq a$ which is a contradiction. Thus, a is a cluster point of the filter $\mathcal{F}$.

Proposition A.2.8 *Let A be a non-empty linearly ordered set endowed with the interval topology. If every closed interval $[x, y]$, $x, y \in A$, $x < y$, is a connected subset of A, then the topological space A is connected.*

Proof: If $A = X \cup Y$ where X and Y are non-empty disjoint open subsets of A and if $x \in X$, $y \in Y$ with $x < y$, then the closed interval $I = [x, y]$ is not connected. Indeed, $I = (I \cap X) \cup (I \cap Y)$, where the traces $I \cap X$, $I \cap Y$ are non-empty, disjoint, and open (with respect to the induced topology) sets of I.

Proposition A.2.9 *Let A be a non-empty linearly ordered set endowed with the interval topology and let B be a non-empty subset of A, bounded from above. Let U be the set of all upper bounds of B and L be the set of all lower bounds of U. Then one has:*

(i) *L and U are non-empty subsets of A with $A = L \cup U$.*

(ii) *The following three statements are equivalent:*

(a) *$z \in L \cap U$;*

(b) *z is the greatest element of L;*

(c) *$z = \sup B$.*

(iii) *If the intersection $L \cap U$ is empty, then L and U are open sets and A is not connected.*

Proof: (i) We have $B \subset L$ and, in particular, $L \neq \emptyset$. Since B is bounded from above, $U \neq \emptyset$. If $x \in A$ then either $x \in U$, or there exists $b \in B$ with $x < b$ and this implies $x < y$ for all $y \in U$, hence $x \in L$.

(ii) (a) $\Longrightarrow$ (b) and (c). The members $z \in L \cap U$ satisfy $z \in L$, $x \leq z$ for all $x \in L$, and $z \in U$, $z \leq y$ for all $y \in U$. In other words, z is the greatest element of L and the least element of U.

(b) or (c) $\Longrightarrow$ (a). Let z be the greatest element of L, that is, $x \leq z$ for all $x \in L$ and $z \leq y$ for all $y \in U$. In particular, $z \in U$. Finally, let $z = \sup B$, that is, $z \in U$ and $z \leq y$ for all $y \in U$. In particular, $z \in L$.

(iii) Let $L \cap U = \emptyset$. Part (i) implies that the subset B has no least upper bound, that is, for any $y \in U$ there exists $y' \in U$ with $y \in (y', \rightarrow)$. Thus U is an open set. Because of part (ii) the subset L has no greatest element. Therefore for any $x \in L$ there exists $x' \in L$ with $x \in (\leftarrow, x')$. In other words, L is an open set too and because of part (i), the topological space A is not connected.

Proposition A.2.10 *Let A be a non-empty linearly ordered set endowed with the interval topology. If the topological space A is connected, then:*

(i) *Every non-empty bounded from above subset $B \subset A$ has a least upper bound.*

(ii) *A is a set without gaps.*

Proof: (i) Let U be the set of all upper bounds of B and L be the set of all lower bounds of U. Proposition A.2.9, (iii), implies that the intersection $L \cap U$ is not empty and then Proposition A.2.9, (ii), yields the result.

(ii) If A is a set with gaps, then there exist $x < y$ such that the open interval (x, y) is empty. Then

$$A = (\leftarrow, x] \cup [y, \rightarrow)$$

hence the set A is not connected — a contradiction.

After passing to the dual structure A^{op}, part (i) of Proposition A.2.10 yields

Corollary A.2.11 *Let A be a non-empty linearly ordered set endowed with the interval topology. If the topological space A is connected, then every non-empty bounded from below subset $B \subset A$ has a greatest lower bound.*

Combining Proposition A.2.7, Proposition A.2.10, Corollary A.2.11, and taking into account Corollary 1.8.10, we obtain immediately

Proposition A.2.12 *Let A be a non-empty linearly ordered set endowed with the interval topology. If the topological space A is connected, then every non-empty bounded and closed subset $B \subset A$ is compact.*

Corollary A.2.13 *Every bounded and closed interval is compact.*

Proposition A.2.14 *If the conditions* (i), (ii) *of Proposition A.2.10 hold, then every closed interval $[x, y]$, $x < y$, is connected.*

Proof: Suppose that conditions (i), (ii) hold and let $I = [x, y]$, $x < y$, be a closed interval which is a disjoint union of two non-empty closed (with respect to the induced topology) sets X and Y with $y \in Y$. Since X is bounded from above by y, it possesses a least upper bound $z = \sup_A X$ and we have $z \leq y$. Moreover, there exists a $x' \in X$ and then the inequalities $x \leq x'$, $x' \leq z$ imply $z \in I$. Since X is closed in I, Corollary A.2.6 yields $z \in X$. Both possibilities $z = y$ and $z < y$ lead to the contradiction $z \in X \cap Y$, the second one by using the inclusion $(z, y) \subset Y$, Proposition A.2.5, and the closeness of Y.

Corollary A.2.13 and Proposition A.2.14 imply

Corollary A.2.15 *Let A be a non-empty linearly ordered set endowed with the interval topology. If the topological space A is connected, then A is locally compact and locally connected.*

Proposition A.2.16 *If A is a non-empty linearly ordered set endowed with the interval topology and if the two conditions* (i) *and* (ii) *from Proposition A.2.10 hold, then A is connected.*

Proof: Proposition A.2.14 and Proposition A.2.8 imply that the set A is connected.

Propositions A.2.10 and A.2.16 yield immediately

Corollary A.2.17 *let A be a non-empty linearly ordered set endowed with the interval topology. The topological space A is connected if and only if the two conditions* (i) *and* (ii) *from Proposition A.2.10 hold.*

Proposition A.2.18 *Let A be a non-empty linearly ordered set endowed with the interval topology. If A is connected, then a subset of A is connected if and only if it is an interval (bounded or not bounded).*

Proof: Proposition A.2.10 and Proposition A.2.14 yield that every bounded closed interval is connected. Now, let I be any interval and let $x, y \in I$, $x < y$. Then $[x, y] \subset I$ and the closed interval $[x, y]_I = [x, y]$ is a connected subset of I. According to Proposition A.2.8, the interval I is a connected subset of A. Now, let $B \subset A$ be a connected subset of A. If $B = \emptyset$ or $B = \{y\}$, then $B = (x, x)$, for any $x \in A$, or, $B = [y, y]$, respectively. Now, let $x, y \in B$, $x < y$ and let $z \in A$, $x < z < y$. If $z \notin B$, then $J = (\leftarrow, z]_B = (\leftarrow, z)_B$ is a non-empty open and closed subset of B. The connectedness of B implies $J = B$ and this equality contradicts $y \notin J$. Thus, $z \in B$ and for any $x, y \in B$, $x < y$, we have $[x, y]_B = [x, y]$. If B is not bounded from below and from above we obtain $B = A = (\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$. If the subset B is bounded from above, not bounded from below, and if $z = \sup B$, we obtain $B = (\leftarrow, z)$ or $B = (\leftarrow, z]$ in case $z \notin B$ or $z \in B$, respectively. Dually, if B is bounded from below, not bounded from above and if $z = \inf B$, we obtain $B = (z, \rightarrow)$ or $B = [z, \rightarrow)$ in case $z \notin B$ or $z \in B$, respectively. Finally, if B is bounded, $x = \inf B$, and $y = \sup B$, then $x < y$ (B has at least two points), and B coincides with one of the four intervals with end-points x and y.

Lemma A.2.19 *Let A and B be linearly ordered sets endowed with the interval topology, let A be connected, and let $f \colon A \to B$ be a continuous map with image $C = f(A)$.*

(i) *For any $x < y$ in A the image J of the closed interval $[x, y]$ is an interval in C, which contains the closed interval in C with endpoints $f(x)$ and $f(y)$.*

If, in addition, f is an injective map, then:

(ii) *The image J coincides with the closed interval in C with endpoints $f(x)$ and $f(y)$.*

(iii) *The map f is strictly monotonic on any three-element subset of A.*

Proof: (i) The image C is a connected subset of B and Proposition A.2.18 yields that J is an interval (bounded or not bounded) in C. Moreover, $f(x), f(y) \in J$, so the closed interval in C with endpoints $f(x)$ and $f(y)$ is a subset of J.

(ii) Let f be an injective map and let $z \in (x, y)$. First, let us suppose that $f(x) < f(y)$. If $f(z) < f(x)$, then in accord with part (i), there exists $x' \in [z, y]$ such that $f(x) = f(x')$ and the injectivity of f contradicts the inequality $x < x'$. The case $f(y) < f(z)$ can be treated similarly. Thus, the inequality $f(x) < f(y)$ implies $f(x) < f(z) < f(y)$. Following the same way, the inequality $f(y) < f(x)$ implies $f(y) < f(z) < f(x)$. In both cases we obtain that J coincides with the closed interval in C with endpoints $f(x)$ and $f(y)$.

(iii) Let $T = \{x, y, z\}$ be a three-element subset of A, let $x < z < y$, and let, for example, $f(x) < f(y)$. The inequality $f(x) < f(y) < f(z)$ (respectively, $f(z) < f(x) < f(y)$) and part (ii) yield the existence of an element $y' \in (x, z)$ (respectively, $x' \in (z, y)$) such that $f(y) = f(y')$ (respectively, $f(x) = f(x')$) which produces contradiction to the injectivity of f. Thus, $f(x) < f(z) < f(y)$ and f is strictly increasing on T. By considering the dual order on Y, in the case $f(y) < f(x)$ we prove that f is strictly decreasing on T.

Corollary A.2.20 *Let A and B be linearly ordered sets endowed with the interval topology, let A be a connected topological space, and let $f \colon A \to B$ be a map with image $C = f(A)$. Then f is a homeomorphism of A onto the subspace C if and only if f is continuous and strictly monotonic.*

Proof: We suppose that the set A has at least two elements, the case of a singleton A being clear. Let f be a continuous and strictly monotonic map. After eventual change of the poset structure of B with its dual B^{op} (this leaves the interval topology on B invariant), we can suppose that f is a strictly increasing map. Proposition A.1.4 implies that f is an isomorphism of posets of A and C. Therefore f maps the open interval (x, y) in A onto the open interval $(f(x), f(y))$ in C. Thus, the bijection $f\colon A \to C$ is a continuous and open map. In particular, its inverse $f^{-1}\colon C \to A$ is a continuous map, too.

Now, let f be a homeomorphism of A onto its image C. In particular, f is an injective and continuous map. Let us suppose that there exist two pairs $x, y \in A$, $x < y$, and $x', y' \in A$, $x' < y'$, such that $f(x) < f(y)$ and $f(y') < f(x')$. In case the intersection $\{x, y\} \cap \{x', y'\}$ is a singleton, Lemma A.2.19, (iii), yields that f is strictly monotonic on the triple $\{x, y\} \cup \{x', y'\}$ which is a contradiction. Otherwise, f is strictly increasing on the triple $\{x, y, x'\}$ and strictly decreasing on the triple $\{x, x', y'\}$, which again is a contradiction because $\{x, y, x'\} \cap \{x, x', y'\} = \{x, x'\}$.

Corollary A.2.21 *Let A be a countable linearly ordered set endowed with the interval topology.*

(i) *There exists a strictly increasing homeomorphism of A onto one of the intervals of the rational line $\mathbb{Q}$ with endpoints 0 and 1, endowed with its interval topology.*

(ii) *There exists a strictly increasing homeomorphism of A onto a subspace of $\mathbb{Q}$.*

Proof: (i) According to Corollary A.1.10, there exists a strictly increasing map f of A onto an interval I in $\mathbb{Q}$ with endpoints 0 and 1, which turns out to be an poset isomorphism of A onto I, because of Proposition A.1.4. Now, Proposition A.2.2 yields that f is a homeomorphism of A and I endowed with their interval topologies.

(ii) In accord with Examples A.2.1, (3), the map f is a strictly increasing homeomorphism of A onto a subspace of $\mathbb{Q}$.

Remark A.2.22 If A is a countable partially ordered set endowed with the interval topology, then it is not necessarily true that it can be embedded as a subspace of the rational line $\mathbb{Q}$. Something more, A can not be embedded as a subspace of any linearly ordered set L endowed with its interval topology. Indeed, let A be the countable partially ordered set with partial order $\leq_A$ from Examples A.2.1, (4), and suppose that there exists a linearly ordered set L with partial order $\leq_L$, and a strictly increasing homeomorphism f of A onto a subspace of L. Using f, we can identify A and its image and can suppose that $A \subset L$ is a subspace of L such that $a <_A b$ implies $a <_L b$. In other words, the only inequalities in A are

$$\frac{1}{i} <_A \frac{1}{j},\ i, j \in \mathbb{N},\ 1 \leq j < i \leq n,$$

$$0 <_A \frac{1}{i},\ i \in \mathbb{N},\ 1 \le i \le n,$$

and we have

$$\frac{1}{i} <_L \frac{1}{j},\ i, j \in \mathbb{N},\ 1 \le j < i \le n,$$

$$0 <_L \frac{1}{i},\ i \in \mathbb{N},\ 1 \le i \le n.$$

Let $r_1, r_2, r_3 \in A$ be three pairwise different rational numbers strictly greater than $\frac{1}{2}$ and strictly less than 1. We can suppose that $r_1 <_L r_2 <_L r_3$. then $U = (r_1, r_3)_L \cap A$ is a non-empty open set of A, $r_2 \in U$, and this contradicts the form of the open sets in A, established in Examples A.2.1, (4).

Let U be the set of the four intervals in $\mathbb{R}$ with endpoints 0, 1. For each $I \in U$ we set $I_{\mathbb{Q}} = I \cap \mathbb{Q}$. Let A be a linearly ordered set, let E be the set of its extremal elements (the least and the greatest element of A, if exist), and let C be a proper countable subset of A, which is order dense in A. We can suppose that $E \subset C$. Then the linearly ordered set A has no gaps and hence C itself has no gaps. Now, Corollary A.2.21 yields the existence of a strictly increasing homeomorphism f of A onto some interval $I_{\mathbb{Q}}$ in the rational line $\mathbb{Q}$ where $I \in U$. Moreover, $f(E) \subset \{0, 1\}$. Let us set $C' = C \backslash E$. Given $a \in A \backslash E$, we have the decomposition

$$C' = \begin{cases} ((\leftarrow, a)_A \cap C) \cup ((a, \rightarrow)_A \cap C) \cup \{a\} & \text{if } a \in C' \\ ((\leftarrow, a)_A \cap C) \cup ((a, \rightarrow)_A \cap C) & \text{if } a \in A \backslash C \end{cases}$$

and denote $I(a)_- = f((\leftarrow, a) \cap C)$, $I(a)_+ = f((a, \rightarrow) \cap C)$. Then the pair $(I(a)_-, I(a)_+)$ is a Dedekind cut. If $a \in C'$, then $I(a)_- = f((\leftarrow, a) \cap C) = (-\infty, f(a))$, $I(a)_+ = (f(a), \infty)$, and

$$I^\circ = I(a)_- \cup I(a)_+ \cup \{f(c)\},$$

where I° is the open interval with endpoints 0 and 1. Thus, for any $a \in C'$ the Dedekind cut $(I(a)_-, I(a)_+)$ represents the rational number $f(a) \in I^\circ$ and we identify them: $f(a) = (I(a)_-, I(a)_+)$. If $a \in A \backslash C$, then

$$I^\circ = I(a)_- \cup I(a)_+$$

and the Dedekind cut $(I(a)_-, I(a)_+)$ represents an irrational number $1 < \alpha < 1$: $\alpha = (I(a)_-, I(a)_+)$. We set $F(a) = \alpha$ for any $a \in A \backslash C$, $F(a) = f(a)$ for any $a \in C$, and obtain a map

$$F \colon A \to I \tag{A.2.1}$$

which is an extension of f on A.

Lemma A.2.23 *The map F from (A.2.1) is strictly increasing and extends the homeomorphism* $f \colon C \to I_{\mathbb{Q}}$ *on A.*

Proof: It is enough to show that F is a strictly increasing map. Let $a, b \in A$ with $a < b$. Since C is order dense in A, there exists an element $c \in C$ with $a < c < b$. Then $f(c) \in I(a)_+ \cap I(b)_-$ and this implies $F(a) < F(b)$.

Theorem A.2.24 *Let A be a linearly ordered set endowed with the interval topology, let A be a connected topological space, and let C be a countable subset which is dense in A. Then there exists a strictly increasing homeomorphism of A onto one of the intervals $I \in U$, which maps C onto the interval $I_{\mathbb{Q}}$.*

Proof: We can suppose $E \subset C$. In accord with Proposition A.2.10, (ii), A has no gaps and under this condition Corollary A.1.11 guarantees that C has a bounded from above subset B which has no least upper bound in C. In particular, Proposition A.2.10 yields $C \neq A$ because A is connected. Lemma A.2.23 implies that the map F from (A.2.1) is strictly increasing and extends the homeomorphism $f \colon C \to I_{\mathbb{Q}}$ on A. Now, we will prove the surjectivity of F. Let α, $1 < \alpha < 1$, be an irrational number, represented by the Dedekind cut (I_-, I_+) of the open interval I°, so

$$I^\circ = I_- \cup I_+,$$

and let $C_- = f^{-1}(I_-)$, $C_+ = f^{-1}(I_+)$. Then C_- and C_+ are not empty,

$$C' = C_- \cup C_+, \tag{A.2.2}$$

and $C_- \cap C_+ = \emptyset$. Let $a \in C_-$ and $b \in C_+$. Since $f(a) \in I_-$ and $f(b) \in I_+$, we have $f(a) < f(b)$ and this inequality implies $a < b$. Thus, C_- consists of lower bounds of C_+ and C_+ consists of upper bounds of C_-. Let $a_- = \sup C_-$ and $a_+ = \inf C_+$. Then we have $a_- \leq a_+$. Since there are no gaps in A and since C is dense in A, the assumption $a_- < a_+$ implies existence of an element $c \in (a_-, a_+) \cap C'$, which contradicts the equality (A.2.2). Therefore $a = a_- = a_+$ and

$$C_- \subset (\leftarrow, a) \cap C', \; C_+ \subset (a, \rightarrow) \cap C'. \tag{A.2.3}$$

If $a \in C'$, then the equality (A.2.2) contradicts the equality (A.2.3). Thus, $a \in A \backslash C$ and we have

$$C' = C_- \cup C_+ \subset (\leftarrow, a) \cap C' \cup (a, \rightarrow) \cap C' = C'.$$

The last inclusions imply

$$C_- = (\leftarrow, a) \cap C', \; C_+ = (a, \rightarrow) \cap C'$$

and then $I(a)_- \subset I_-$, $I(a)_+ \subset I_+$, hence

$$F(a) = (I(a)_-, I(a)_+) = (I_-, I_+) = \alpha$$

and therefore the map F is surjective. Thus, we have a strictly increasing bijection $F \colon A \to I$ which is a homeomorphism of A onto the subspace I of the real line $\mathbb{R}$ because of Proposition A.2.2, (ii).

References

[1] G. Birkhoff, *Latice Theory*, American Mathematical Society, 1948.

[2] N. Bourbaki, *Elements of Mathematics, Theory of Sets*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2004.

[3] N. Bourbaki, *Elements of Mathematics, General Topology, Ch. I - IV*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1989.

[4] G. Debreu, Representation of a preference ordering by a numerical function, in *Decision Processes*, John Wiley, 1954.

[5] S. Eilenberg, Ordered topological spaces, American Journal of Mathematics, 63, No 1 (1941), 39-45.

[6] P. C. Fishburn, *Utility Theory for Decision Making*, Wiley, New York, 1970.

[7] S. O. Hansson, T. Grune-Yanoff, *Preferences, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2012 Edition)*, URL = http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/preferences/

[8] F. Hausdorf, *Grundzüge der Mengelehre*, Berlin, 1914.

[9] D. M. Kreps, *A Course in Microeconomic Theory*, Prentice Hall, 1990.

[10] E. A. Ok, Utility Representation of an Incomplete Preference Relation, Journal of Economic Theory, 104, No 2 (2002), 429-449.

[11] E. A. Ok, *Real Analysis with Economic Applications*, Princeton University Press, 2007.

[12] M. Rechenauer, On the non-equivalence of weak and strict preference, Mathematical Social Sciences, 56 (2008), 386-388.